arXiv:1302.2103v1 [math.AG] 8 Feb 2013

HYPERSURFACE ARRANGEMENTS AND A GLOBAL BRIESKORN-ORLIK-SOLOMON THEOREM

CLÉMENT DUPONT

Abstract. We give a model for the cohomology of the complement of a hypersurface arrangement inside a smooth projective complex variety. This generalizes the case of normal crossing divisors, which is due to P. Deligne as a by-product of the mixed Hodge theory of smooth complex varieties. Our model is a global version of the Orlik-Solomon algebra, which computes the cohomology of the complement of a union of hyperplanes in an affine space. The main tool is the complex of logarithmic forms along a hypersurface arrangement, and its weight filtration. Connections with wonderful compactifications and the configuration spaces of points on curves are also studied.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. The local case: central hyperplane arrangements 7
3. An abstract version of the Orlik-Solomon algebra 10
4. Logarithmic forms and the weight filtration 12
5. The global case: hypersurface arrangements 17
6. A functorial mixed Hodge structure and the Gysin model 20
7. Wonderful compactifications and the Gysin model 26
8. Configuration spaces of points on curves 29
References 32

1. Introduction

Let X be a complex manifold of dimension n. A hypersurface arrangement in X is a union

$$L = \bigcup_{1\leq i\leq l} L_i \subset X$$

of smooth hypersurfaces $L_i \subset X$, that locally looks like a union of hyperplanes in $\mathbb{C}^n$: around each point of X we can find a system of local coordinates in which each L_i is defined by a linear equation.

This generalizes the notion of a (simple) normal crossing divisor: a hypersurface arrangement is a normal crossing divisor if the local linear equations defining the L_i's are everywhere linearly independent; in other words, if we can always choose local coordinates $(z_1, \cdots, z_n)$ such that L is locally defined by the equation $z_1 \cdots z_r = 0$ for some r.

We sum up our geometric setting in the following table.

local situation	global situation
$\bigcup_{1\leq i\leq r}\{z_i = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$	normal crossing divisor $D \subset X$
$\bigcup_{1\leq i\leq l} L_i \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, L_i hyperplanes, $0 \in L_i$	hypersurface arrangement $L \subset X$

Figure 1. The setting

Besides normal crossing divisors, examples of hypersurface arrangements include unions of hyperplanes in a projective space $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{C})$, or unions of diagonals $\Delta_{i,j} = \{y_i = y_j\} \subset Y^n$ inside the n-fold cartesian product of a complex curve Y.

If L is a hypersurface arrangement in X, we will always assume that the strata

$$L_I = \bigcap_{i\in I} L_i$$

for $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ are connected.

The aim of this paper is to give a model for the cohomology (more precisely, the weight-graded cohomology algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$) of the complement $X \setminus L$ of a hypersurface arrangement, when X is a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$.

Let us recall that for B a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ and $A \subset B$ a smooth hypersurface, the Gysin morphisms of the inclusion $A \hookrightarrow B$ are the morphisms $H^{k-2}(A)(-1) \to H^k(B)$ obtained as the Poincaré duals of the natural morphisms $H^{2n-k}(B) \to H^{2n-k}(A)$ where $n = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(B)$.

Our main result is the following theorem (Theorem 6.9):

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ and L a hypersurface arrangement in X.*

(1) For each q we construct a complex $M_q^\bullet(X, L)$ in the category of pure Hodge structures of weight q over $\mathbb{Q}$ as an explicit quotient

$$M_q^n(X, L) = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=q-n \\ I \text{ indep.}}} H^{2n-q}(L_I)(n - q) \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

the differential $d : M_q^n(X, L) \to M_q^{n+1}(X, L)$ being induced by the (signed) Gysin morphisms

$$H^{2n-q}(L_I)(n - q) \to H^{2n-q+2}(L_{I\setminus\{i\}})(n + 1 - q)$$

of the inclusions of the strata $L_I \hookrightarrow L_{I\setminus\{i\}}$. The cup-product on the cohomology of the strata gives products

$$M_q^n(X, L) \otimes M_{q'}^{n'}(X, L) \to M_{q+q'}^{n+n'}(X, L)$$

so that the direct sum

$$M^\bullet(X, L) = \bigoplus_q M_q^\bullet(X, L)$$

is a dga in the (semi-simple) category of split mixed Hodge structures over $\mathbb{Q}$.

(2) The dga $M^\bullet(X, L)$ is a model for the cohomology of $X \setminus L$ in the following sense: we have isomorphisms of pure Hodge structures over $\mathbb{Q}$

$$H^n(M_q^\bullet(X, L)) \cong \mathrm{gr}_q^W H^n(X \setminus L)$$

which are compatible with the algebra structures. These isomorphisms are functorial with respect to (X, L).

We call the dga $M^\bullet(X, L)$ the **Gysin model** of (X, L); its precise definition is given in §1.1. Theorem 1.1 generalizes the case of normal crossing divisors, which is due to P. Deligne ([6], see also [21], 8.35) as a by-product of the definition of the mixed Hodge structure on the cohomology of smooth varieties over $\mathbb{C}$.

We should say a word on the usefulness of our generalization from normal crossing divisors to hypersurface arrangements. Indeed, Deligne's approach relies on the fact that any smooth variety over $\mathbb{C}$ can be viewed as the complement of a normal crossing divisor inside a smooth projective variety, using Nagata's compactification theorem and Hironaka's resolution of singularities. Thus the case of normal crossing divisors is (abstractly) sufficient to give a model for the cohomology of *any* smooth variety over $\mathbb{C}$.

In the framework of Theorem 1.1, we may even produce, following [5], [8], [9], [13], an explicit sequence of blow-ups (see Theorem 7.4)

$$\pi : \widetilde{X} \to X$$

sometimes called a "wonderful compactification", that transforms L into a normal crossing divisor $\widetilde{L} = \pi^{-1}(L)$ inside $\widetilde{X}$ and induces an isomorphism

$$\pi : \widetilde{X} \setminus \widetilde{L} \overset{\simeq}{\to} X \setminus L$$

Thus Deligne's special case of Theorem 1.1 applied to $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$ gives a model $M^\bullet(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$ for the cohomology of $X \setminus L$. The functoriality of our construction gives a quasi-isomorphism

$$M^\bullet(\pi) : M^\bullet(X, L) \to M^\bullet(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$$

that we may compute explicitly (see Theorem 7.6 and the example in §1.4).
The model $M^\bullet(X, L)$ has three advantages over $M^\bullet(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$. Firstly, it is in general smaller (see the example in §1.4). Secondly its definition only uses geometric and combinatorial information from the pair (X, L) (see §1.1) without having to look at the blown-up situation $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$. Thirdly, it is functorial with respect to the pair (X, L).

The reader may want to skip directly to §1.4 to look at an example of a computation using the model $M^\bullet(X, L)$. In the next paragraphs, we first give some details on the construction of $M^\bullet(X, L)$ and on the proof of Theorem 1.1.

1.1. **The Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem and the Gysin model.** In order to understand the cohomology of the complement of a hypersurface arrangement in a smooth projective variety, we should first take a look at the local situation. Let then

$$L = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq l} L_i$$

be a union of hyperplanes in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Each L_i is defined by a non-zero linear form f_i. The cohomology of the complement $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L$ has been well-understood since the works of Brieskorn ([4]) and Orlik-Solomon ([15]), following the pioneering work of Arnol'd ([2]). Their result is that the cohomology algebra (say, with rational coefficients) $H^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L)$ is generated by 1 and the classes of the 1-forms

$$\frac{1}{2i\pi} \frac{df_i}{f_i}$$

and that we know explicitly the ideal of the relations. More precisely, we define the Orlik-Solomon algebra (over $\mathbb{Q}$) as a quotient

$$A_\bullet(L) = \Lambda^\bullet(\mathbb{Q}e_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Q}e_l) / J_\bullet(L)$$

where $J_\bullet(L)$ is the homogeneous ideal generated by the Orlik-Solomon relations:

$$\sum_{s=1}^{k} (-1)^{s-1} e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{e_{i_s}} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_k} = 0$$

for all subsets $\{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\} \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ such that the corresponding hyperplanes $L_{i_1}, \cdots, L_{i_k}$ are linearly dependent. Then the Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem says that there is an isomorphism of algebras (see Theorem 2.5 for a more precise statement)

$$A_\bullet(L) \overset{\simeq}{\to} H^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L)$$

which sends e_i to the class of the form $\dfrac{1}{2i\pi} \dfrac{df_i}{f_i}$.

The aim of this paper is to fill the bottom right corner of the following table, which is parallel to the table of Figure 1.

The point is that on the local side (left column of the above table), the Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem expresses the second line as an explicit quotient of the first line, adding a relation for each dependence relation betwen the hyperplanes. The naive guess (which proves to be the right answer) in the global case is then to quotient the Gysin model from the case of normal crossing divisors by an analogue of the Orlik-Solomon

cohomology of the complement (local situation)	cohomology of the complement (global situation)
$H^\bullet((\mathbb{C}^*)^r \times \mathbb{C}^{n-r}) \cong \Lambda^\bullet(\mathbb{Q}e_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{Q}e_r)$	the Gysin model $M^\bullet(X,D)$ (Deligne)
Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem: $H^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L) \cong A^\bullet(L)$	the Gysin model $M^\bullet(X,L)$ (Theorem 1.1)

Figure 2. Cohomology of the complement

relations. Theorem 1.1 may then be viewed as a global version of the Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem.

Let us consider a subset $I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\} \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ such that the stratum L_I is not empty. We say that I is independent if the codimension of L_I is $|I| = k$. In the opposite case, I is said to be dependent, and for all $s = 1, \cdots, k$ such that $I \setminus \{i_s\}$ is independent, we have for dimension reasons $L_{I\setminus\{i_s\}} = L_I$. Thus we get a map

$$H^\bullet(L_I) \to \bigoplus_{\substack{1\leq s\leq k \\ I\setminus\{i_s\} \text{ indep.}}} H^\bullet(L_{I\setminus\{i_s\}}) \tag{1}$$

where we put $(-1)^{s-1}$ times the identity on the component indexed by s.

We can now state the definition of the Gysin model from Theorem 1.1. We define

$$M^n_q(X,L) = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=q-n \\ I \text{ indep.}}} H^{2n-q}(L_I)(n-q) \right) / \sim_{\text{OS}}$$

where we quotient by the images of the maps (1) for all dependent subsets ($\sim_{\text{OS}}$ stands for Orlik-Solomon). It has to be noted that in the case of a normal crossing divisor, there is no dependence, hence no quotient.

The differential $d : M^n_q(X,L) \to M^{n+1}_q(X,L)$ is induced by the Gysin morphisms

$$H^{2n-q}(L_I)(n-q) \to H^{2n-q+2}(L_{I\setminus\{i\}})(n-q+1)$$

of the inclusions $L_I \hookrightarrow L_{I\setminus\{i\}}$ for I independent of cardinality $q-n$, multiplied by some sign (see §6.4).

The product $M^n_q(X,L) \otimes M^{n'}_{q'}(X,L) \to M^{n+n'}_{q+q'}(X,L)$ is induced by

$$H^{2n-q}(L_I) \otimes H^{2n'-q'}(L_{I'}) \to H^{2n-q}(L_{I\cup I'}) \otimes H^{2n'-q'}(L_{I\cup I'}) \xrightarrow{\cup} H^{2(n+n')-(q+q')}(L_{I\cup I'})$$

for $I \cap I' = \varnothing$, $I \cup I'$ independent, multiplied by some sign (see §6.4). The above morphism is the composition of the restriction morphisms for the inclusion of $L_{I\cup I'}$ inside L_I and $L_{I'}$, followed by the cup-product on $L_{I\cup I'}$.

1.2. **Logarithmic forms and mixed Hodge theory.**

Our approach to prove Theorem 1.1 follows Deligne's proof of the case of normal crossing divisors, hence makes extensive use of logarithmic forms and the formalism of mixed Hodge structures.
Let X be a smooth projective variety and $L = \bigcup_{1\leq i\leq l} L_i$ a hypersurface arrangement in X. The first task is to define a complex of sheaves on X, denoted by $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$, of meromorphic forms on X with logarithmic poles along L. In local coordinates where each L_i is defined by a linear equation $\{f_i = 0\}$, a section of $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$ is a meromorphic differential form on X which is a linear combination over $\mathbb{C}$ of forms of the type

$$\eta \wedge \frac{df_{i_1}}{f_{i_1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{df_{i_s}}{f_{i_s}} \tag{2}$$

with η a holomorphic form and $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_s \leq l$. It has to be noted that the complex $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$ is in general a strict subcomplex of the complex $\Omega^\bullet_X(\log L)$ introduced by Saito ([18]), even though the two complexes coincide in the case of a normal crossing divisor.

The point of the complex $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$ is that it computes the cohomology of the complement $X \setminus L$. More precisely, if we denote by $j : X \setminus L \hookrightarrow X$ the open immersion of the complement of L inside X, we prove the following theorem (Theorem 5.7):

Theorem 1.2. *The inclusion* $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} \hookrightarrow j_*\Omega^\bullet_{X\setminus L}$ *is a quasi-isomorphism, and hence induces isomorphisms*

$$\mathbb{H}^n(\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}) \cong H^n(X \setminus L) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{C}. \tag{3}$$

It has to be noted (Remark 4.16) that according to this theorem, a conjecture of H. Terao ([19]) is equivalent to the fact that the inclusion $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} \subset \Omega^\bullet_X(\log L)$ is a quasi-isomorphism.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is local and relies on the Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem. Another central technical tool is the weight filtration W on $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$: we define $W_k\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} \subset \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$ to be the subcomplex spanned by the forms (2) with $s \leq k$. In view of the isomorphism (3), we get a filtration on the cohomology of $X \setminus L$ which is proved to be defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Together with the Hodge filtration $F^p\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} = \Omega^{\geq p}_{\langle X,L\rangle}$, it defines a mixed Hodge structure on $H^\bullet(X \setminus L)$. The functoriality of our construction then implies that this is the same as the mixed Hodge structure defined by Deligne.

According to the general theory of mixed Hodge structures, the hypercohomology spectral sequence associated to the weight filtration degenerates at the E_2-term, hence the E_1-term gives a model for the cohomology of $X \setminus L$. We then prove that this model is the Gysin model $M^\bullet(X, L)$ described in the previous paragraph.

1.3. **Configuration spaces of points on curves.** Let Y be a complex curve and n an integer. For all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ we have a diagonal

$$\Delta_{i,j} = \{y_i = y_j\} \subset Y^n$$

inside the n-fold cartesian product of Y. Any union of $\Delta_{i,j}$'s then defines a hypersurface arrangement in Y^n. For example, if we consider the union of all diagonals, the complement is the configuration space of n ordered points in Y:

$$C(Y, n) = \{(y_1, \cdots , y_n) \in Y^n \mid y_i \neq y_j \text{ for } i \neq j\}.$$

Theorem 1.1 hence gives a Gysin model for the cohomology of $C(Y, n)$. This model is isomorphic to the one independently found by I. Kriz ([10]) and B. Totaro ([20]), as we prove in Theorem 8.4. It should be noted that our method is close to Totaro's method, since the Gysin spectral sequence that we are considering in §6.3 is indeed the Leray spectral sequence of the inclusion $j : X \setminus L \hookrightarrow X$.

As a natural generalization, we may consider the union of only certain diagonals $\Delta_{i,j}$. Such a generalization has been recently considered by S. Bloch ([3]), who gives a model in the spirit of Kriz and Totaro's model. We prove that this model is also isomorphic to our Gysin model.

1.4. **A basic example.** Let X be a smooth projective surface ($\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(X) = 2$) and $L = L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3$ a hypersurface arrangement in X such that $L_{12} = L_{13} = L_{23} = P$ a point (one can think of 3 lines in $\mathbb{P}^2(\mathbb{C})$ that meet at a point).
Let us consider the blow-up $\pi : \widetilde{X} \to X$ along P. We get a normal crossing divisor $\widetilde{L} = E \cup \widetilde{L}_1 \cup \widetilde{L}_2 \cup \widetilde{L}_3$ in $\widetilde{X}$, where $E = \pi^{-1}(P)$ is the exceptional divisor and $\widetilde{L}_i$ is the strict transform of L_i, and π induces an isomorphism $\pi : \widetilde{X} \setminus \widetilde{L} \xrightarrow{\cong} X \setminus L$.

We explicitly describe, for $q = 2$ and $q = 4$, the complexes $M^\bullet_q(X, L)$ and $M^\bullet_q(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$, and the quasi-isomorphism $M^\bullet_q(\pi) : M^\bullet_q(X, L) \xrightarrow{\sim} M^\bullet_q(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$, described in general by the formulas in Theorem 7.6. For the sake of simplicity, we do not write the Tate twists.

(1) $q = 2$. The quasi-isomorphism $M_2^\bullet(\pi) : M_2^\bullet(X,L) \overset{\sim}{\to} M_2^\bullet(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{L})$ is described by the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_2^\bullet(X,L) : \arrow[d, "M_2^\bullet(\pi)"] & 0 \arrow[r] & H^0(L_1)\oplus H^0(L_2)\oplus H^0(L_3) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "M_2^0(\pi)"'] & H^2(X) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "M_2^1(\pi)"'] & 0 \\
M_2^\bullet(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{L}) : & 0 \arrow[r] & H^0(E)\oplus H^0(\widetilde{L}_1)\oplus H^0(\widetilde{L}_2)\oplus H^0(\widetilde{L}_3) \arrow[r] & H^2(\widetilde{X}) \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here the Gysin models are concentrated in degrees 0 and 1. The differentials are given by the obvious Gysin morphisms. In degree 1, $M_2^1(\pi)$ is just the pull-back $\pi^* : H^2(X) \to H^2(\widetilde{X})$. In degree 0, $M_2^0(\pi)$ is defined by

$$H^0(L_i) \to H^0(E) \oplus H^0(\widetilde{L}_i)\,,\ 1 \mapsto (1,1).$$

The fact that $M_2^\bullet(\pi)$ is a morphism of complexes is equivalent to the following equality in $H^2(\widetilde{X})$:

$$\pi^*([L_i]) = [E] + [\widetilde{L}_i].$$

It is easy to check by hand that $M_2^\bullet(\pi)$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Roughly speaking, the cohomology classes that are added in the blown-up situation “do not contribute” to the cohomology of the complex.

(2) $q = 4$. The quasi-isomorphism $M_4^\bullet(\pi) : M_4^\bullet(X,L) \overset{\sim}{\to} M_4^\bullet(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{L})$ is described by the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & (H^0(L_{12})\oplus H^0(L_{13})\oplus H^0(L_{23}))/\sim_{\mathrm{OS}} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "M_4^0(\pi)"'] & H^2(L_1)\oplus H^2(L_2)\oplus H^2(L_3) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "M_4^1(\pi)"'] & H^4(X) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "M_4^2(\pi)"'] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & H^0(E\cap\widetilde{L}_1)\oplus H^0(E\cap\widetilde{L}_2)\oplus H^0(E\cap\widetilde{L}_3) \arrow[r] & H^2(E)\oplus H^2(\widetilde{L}_1)\oplus H^2(\widetilde{L}_2)\oplus H^2(\widetilde{L}_3) \arrow[r] & H^4(\widetilde{X}) \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

We see the quotient $/\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$ appearing in $M_4^0(X,L)$. By definition, it kills the elements $(x,-x,x) \in H^0(L_{12}) \oplus H^0(L_{13}) \oplus H^0(L_{23})$, hence $M_4^0(X,L)$ has dimension 2. The differentials are still given by the Gysin morphisms (with the usual signs that ensure that the differentials square to zero). In degrees 1 and 2, $M_4^\bullet(\pi)$ is given by the pull-backs $\pi^* : H^2(L_i) \to H^2(\widetilde{L}_i)$ and $\pi^* : H^4(X) \to H^4(\widetilde{X})$. In degree 0, $M_4^0(\pi)$ is defined by

$$H^0(L_{ij}) \to H^0(E\cap\widetilde{L}_i) \oplus H^0(E\cap\widetilde{L}_j)\,,\ 1 \mapsto (-1,1).$$

It is easy to check by hand that this passes to the quotient by $\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$ and defines a quasi-isomorphism. In fact, in this particular case, the complexes $M_4^\bullet(X,L)$ and $M_4^\bullet(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{L})$ are acyclic.

1.5. Open questions.

(1) It is tempting to ask for a generalization of the Gysin model to the cohomology of $X \setminus L$ where $L \subset X$ locally looks like a union of sub-vector spaces of any codimension inside $\mathbb{C}^n$. For example, as configuration spaces of points are concerned, it is striking that Kriz and Totaro’s model (as well as Bloch’s generalization) applies without any restriction on the dimension of Y. If Y has dimension > 1, then Theorem 1.1 does not apply since the diagonals are no longer hypersurfaces.

(2) In [20], B. Totaro suggests a particular case of the previous question, focusing on vector spaces V_i of a fixed codimension c such that all intersections $V_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap V_{i_r}$ have codimension a multiple of c (this paper handles the case $c = 1$).

1.6. **Outline of the paper.** In §§2−4, we focus on the local case and study central hyperplane arrangements in $\mathbb{C}^n$. We first recall (§2) some classical facts about the Orlik-Solomon algebra and the Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem, and define (§3) an abstract version of the Orlik-Solomon algebra which proves useful in the sequel. We then introduce (§4) the complex of logarithmic forms along a central hyperplane arrangement and its weight filtration, and prove the local form (Theorem 4.13) of the comparison theorem 1.2.

In §5, we globalize our constructions, define the complexes of sheaves $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$ and prove the comparison theorem 1.2 (Theorem 5.7).

In §6, we use the formalism of mixed Hodge modules to give an alternative definition of the mixed Hodge

structure on the cohomology of $X \setminus L$. This allows us to prove Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 6.9).
In §7, we study the functoriality of our construction with respect to blow-ups. This gives (Theorem 7.6) the explicit quasi-isomorphisms $M^\bullet(\pi) : M^\bullet(X,L) \xrightarrow{\sim} M^\bullet(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{L})$ associated to wonderful compactifications $\pi : (\widetilde{X},\widetilde{L}) \to (X,L)$.
In §8, we apply our results to configuration spaces of points on curves and prove (Theorem 8.4) the isomorphism between the Gysin model and the model proposed by Kriz and Totaro and generalized by Bloch.

1.7. Conventions and notations.

(1) *(Cohomology and coefficients)* If Y is a complex manifold, we will simply write $H^p(Y)$ for the p-th singular cohomology group of Y with rational coefficients. We will simply write $H^p(Y)\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{C}$ for the p-th singular cohomology group of Y with complex coefficients. This group is naturally isomorphic, via the de Rham isomorphism, to the p-th de Rham cohomology group of Y tensored with $\mathbb{C}$, hence we allow ourselves to use smooth differential forms as representatives for cohomology classes.
All (mixed) Hodge structures are implicitly defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.

(2) *(Holomorphic forms)* If Y is a complex manifold, we write Ω^p_Y for the sheaf of holomorphic p-forms on Y and $\Omega^p(Y) := \Gamma(Y,\Omega^p_Y)$ for the vector space of global holomorphic p-forms on Y.

(3) *(Filtrations and spectral sequences)* Our convention for spectral sequences uses decreasing filtrations. One passes from an increasing filtration $\{W_p\}_{p\in\mathbb{Z}}$ to a decreasing filtration $\{W^p\}_{p\in\mathbb{Z}}$ by putting $W^p = W_{-p}$.

(4) *(Signs)* If I and J are disjoint subsets of a linearly ordered set $\{1,\cdots,n\}$, we define a sign $\mathrm{sgn}(I,J)\in\{\pm1\}$ as follows. In the exterior algebra on n independent generators $x_1,\cdots,x_n$, we write $x_I = x_{i_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge x_{i_k}$ for a set $I=\{i_1<\cdots<i_k\}\subset\{1,\cdots,n\}$. Then $\mathrm{sgn}(I,J)$ is defined by the equation $x_{I\cup J} = \mathrm{sgn}(I,J)x_I\wedge x_J$. For example we get $\mathrm{sgn}(\{i_r\}, I\setminus\{i_r\}) = (-1)^{r-1}$.

1.8. **Acknowledgements.** The author thanks Francis Brown for many corrections and comments on this text, and Spencer Bloch for helpful discussions and for giving him a preliminary version of [3]. This work was partially supported by ERC grant 257638 “Periods in algebraic geometry and physics”.

2. The local case: central hyperplane arrangements

We recall some classical facts about central hyperplane arrangements: the Orlik-Solomon algebra, the nbc basis, the deletion-restriction exact sequence and the Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem. The interested reader will find more details in the expository book [16], or references such as [12] or [22].

2.1. The Orlik-Solomon algebra.

A **central hyperplane arrangement** in $\mathbb{C}^n$ is a set $L=\{L_1,\cdots,L_l\}$ of hyperplanes of $\mathbb{C}^n$, all containing the origin. As the notation suggests, we implicitly fix a linear ordering on the hyperplanes, even though many objects that we will define out of a central hyperplane arrangement will be independent of such an ordering. We will use the same letter L to denote the union of the hyperplanes:

$$L = \bigcup_{1\leq i\leq l} L_i.$$

For a subset $I\subset\{1,\cdots,l\}$, the **stratum** of the arrangement L indexed by I is the vector space

$$L_I = \bigcap_{i\in I} L_i$$

with the convention $L_\varnothing = \mathbb{C}^n$.

We set $\Lambda_\bullet(L) = \Lambda^\bullet(\mathbb{Q}e_1\oplus\cdots\oplus\mathbb{Q}e_l)$, the exterior algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$ with a generator e_i in degree 1 for each L_i. Let $\delta : \Lambda_\bullet(L)\to\Lambda_{\bullet-1}(L)$ be the unique derivation of $\Lambda_\bullet(L)$ such that $\delta(e_i)=1$ for $i=1,\cdots,l$.

For $I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\} \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ we set $e_I = e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_k} \in \Lambda_k(L)$ with the convention $e_\varnothing = 1$. The derivation δ is then given by the formula

$$\delta(e_I) = \sum_{s=1}^{k} (-1)^{s-1} e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{e_{i_s}} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_k} = \sum_{i \in I} \operatorname{sgn}(\{i\}, I \setminus \{i\}) e_{I \setminus \{i\}}.$$

A subset $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ is said to be **independent** (resp. **dependent**) if $\operatorname{codim}(L_I) = |I|$ (resp. $\operatorname{codim}(L_I) < |I|$), which is equivalent to saying that the linear forms defining the L_i's, for $i \in I$, are linearly independent (resp. dependent).

Let $J_\bullet(L)$ be the homogeneous ideal of $\Lambda_\bullet(L)$ generated by the elements $\delta(e_I)$ for $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ dependent. The quotient

$$A_\bullet(L) = \Lambda_\bullet(L)/J_\bullet(L)$$

is a graded algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$ called the **Orlik-Solomon algebra** of the arrangement L. Obviously, it does not depend on the linear order on the hyperplanes.

We will need a presentation of the Orlik-Solomon algebra as a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space:

Lemma 2.1. *As a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space, $A_k(L)$ is spanned by the monomials e_I for I independent with $|I| = k$. The only linear relations between these elements are given, for I' dependent, $|I'| = k + 1$, by*

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in I' \\ I' \setminus \{i\} \text{ indep.}}} \operatorname{sgn}(\{i\}, I' \setminus \{i\}) e_{I' \setminus \{i\}} = 0.$$

Proof. For I dependent and any $i \in I$, $e_I = \pm e_i \wedge \delta e_I \in J(L)$ and the first assertion follows. For the second assertion, it suffices to prove that the ideal $J(L)$ is spanned as a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space by the elements e_I and δe_I for I dependent. Now $J(L)$ is spanned by elements $e_T \wedge \delta e_I$ for I dependent and T any subset of $\{1, \cdots, l\}$. Using the Leibniz rule we see that

$$\pm e_T \wedge \delta e_I = \delta(e_T \wedge e_I) - \sum_{t \in T} \pm e_{T \setminus \{t\}} \wedge e_I.$$

Since I is dependent, $e_T \wedge e_I$ (resp. $e_{T \setminus \{t\}} \wedge e_I$) is either 0 or an $e_{I'}$ for I' dependent. This completes the proof of the lemma. ☐

If $I' \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ is dependent and $I' \setminus \{i\}$ is independent, then for dimension reasons we have $L_{I' \setminus \{i\}} = L_{I'}$. Thus all the sets appearing in the relation in the above lemma define the same stratum. In other words, if we define, for a stratum Σ, $A_\Sigma(L)$ to be the sub-vector space of $A_\bullet(L)$ spanned by the monomials e_I for I such that $L_I = \Sigma$, we have a direct sum decomposition

$$A_k(L) = \bigoplus_{\operatorname{codim}(\Sigma) = k} A_\Sigma(L).$$

This simple remark will be crucial.

2.2. **The nbc basis.** Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^n$. A **circuit** is a minimally dependent subset $C \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$, which means that C is dependent and for all $c \in C$, $C \setminus \{c\}$ is independent. A **broken circuit** is a subset $B \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ such that there is a $k \in \{1, \cdots, l\}$ with $\{k\} \cup B$ a circuit and $k < \min(B)$. A broken circuit is independent. Any broken circuit is obtained by deleting the minimal element of a circuit.
A subset $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ is called an **nbc-set** (for "no broken circuit") if I does not contain a broken circuit. The corresponding monomial e_I is called an **nbc-monomial**. These concepts obviously depend on the chosen linear order on the hyperplanes.

Let $\widetilde{A}_k(L)$ be the sub-vector space of $\Lambda_k(L)$ spanned by the nbc-monomials e_I for $|I| = k$. For any stratum Σ of codimension k, let $\widetilde{A}_\Sigma(L)$ be the sub-vector space of $\Lambda_k(L)$ spanned by the nbc-monomials e_I such that $L_I = \Sigma$. We obviously have a direct sum decomposition

$$\widetilde{A}_k(L) = \bigoplus_{\operatorname{codim}(\Sigma) = k} \widetilde{A}_\Sigma(L).$$

Lemma 2.2. *For any stratum Σ of L, the natural morphism $\widetilde{A}_\Sigma(L) \to A_\Sigma(L)$ is an isomorphism of $\mathbb{Q}$-vector spaces, hence the natural morphism $\widetilde{A}_\bullet(L) \to A_\bullet(L)$ is an isomorphism of graded $\mathbb{Q}$-vector spaces. In other words, the images of the nbc-monomials form a linear basis of the Orlik-Solomon algebra $A_\bullet(L)$, called the* **nbc basis***.*

The proof may be found in [16], Theorem 3.43, or [12], Lemma 4.2.

2.3. **Deletion and restriction.** Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that $l \geq 1$. In this article we will only be concerned about deletion and restriction with respect to the last hyperplane L_l. The **deletion** of L (with respect to L_l) is the arrangement $L' = \{L_1, \cdots, L_{l-1}\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$. The **restriction** of L (with respect to L_l) is the arrangement L'' on $L_l \cong \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ consisting of all the intersections of L_l with the L_i's, $i = 1, \cdots, l-1$. If the hyperplanes L_i are not in general position, it may happen that the cardinality l'' of L'' is less than $l-1$. The only tricky part is the linear ordering of the hyperplanes of L''. We say that the linear ordering of L'' is consistent if there is an increasing surjective map $\lambda : \{1, \cdots, l-1\} \to \{1, \cdots, l''\}$ such that $L''_{\lambda(i)} = L_l \cap L_i$. Starting from an arbitrary linear ordering of the hyperplanes in L, such a λ does not always exist, but we can reorder the L_i's so that it does exist. We will always assume that we are in this situation when discussing the restriction of an arrangement, and fix such a λ.

The nbc-sets are well-adapted to deletion and restriction, as is shown in the next lemma, whose proof is left to the reader.

Lemma 2.3. *Let I be a subset of $\{1, \cdots, l\}$.*

1. *If $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l-1\}$, I is an nbc-set for L if and only if it an nbc-set for L'.*
2. *Suppose $l \in I$. Then I is an nbc-set for L if and only if $\lambda(I \setminus \{l\})$ is an nbc-set for L''. Furthermore, for I and J distinct nbc-sets for L containing l, the nbc-sets $\lambda(I \setminus \{l\})$ and $\lambda(J \setminus \{l\})$ are distinct. Thus $I \mapsto \lambda(I \setminus \{l\})$ gives a bijection between the nbc-sets for L containg l and the nbc-sets for L''.*

As a corollary, we have a short exact sequence of $\mathbb{Q}$-vector spaces

$$0 \to \widetilde{A}_k(L') \xrightarrow{i} \widetilde{A}_k(L) \xrightarrow{j} \widetilde{A}_{k-1}(L'') \to 0$$

where i is the natural inclusion and j is defined by $j(e_I) = 0$ if I does not contain l, and $j(e_I) = e_{\lambda(I \setminus \{l\})}$ if I contains l.

In view of Lemma 2.2, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \widetilde{A}_k(L') \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & \widetilde{A}_k(L) \arrow[r, "j"] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & \widetilde{A}_{k-1}(L'') \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & A_k(L') \arrow[r, "i"] & A_k(L) \arrow[r, "j"] & A_{k-1}(L'') \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Thus the bottom row of this diagram is a short exact sequence which is called the deletion-restriction short exact sequence. It can be defined without any reference to the nbc-basis, with the same formulas for i and j. Notably, it has to be noted that it does not depend on the choices of linear orderings.

2.4. **The Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem.** Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^n$. For $i = 1, \cdots, l$ we fix a linear form f_i on $\mathbb{C}^n$ that defines L_i: $L_i = \{f_i = 0\}$. Such a form is unique up to a non-zero multiplicative constant.

We set

$$\omega_i = \frac{df_i}{f_i}$$

viewed as a holomorphic 1-form on $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L$. For a subset $I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\} \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ we set

$$\omega_I = \omega_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_{i_k}.$$

Let $\Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L)$ be the algebra of global holomorphic forms on $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L$ and $R^\bullet(L) \subset \Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L)$ be the subalgebra over $\mathbb{Q}$ generated by 1 and the forms $\frac{1}{2i\pi}\omega_i$ for $i = 1, \cdots, l$. We define a morphism of graded algebras $u : \Lambda_\bullet(L) \to R^\bullet(L)$ by the formula

$$u(e_i) = \frac{1}{2i\pi}\omega_i.$$

A simple computation shows:

Lemma 2.4. *For $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ a dependent subset, we have the relation in $\Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L)$:*

$$\sum_{i \in I} \operatorname{sgn}(\{i\}, I \setminus \{i\})\omega_{I \setminus \{i\}} = 0.$$

Thus u passes to the quotient and defines a map of graded algebras

$$u : A_\bullet(L) \to R^\bullet(L)$$

Each form $\frac{1}{2i\pi}\omega_i$ is closed and its class is in the cohomology of $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L$ with *rational* (and even integer) coefficients. Indeed, let $f_i^* : H^1(\mathbb{C}^*) \to H^1(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L)$ be the pullback map induced by f_i in cohomology. Then the class of $\frac{1}{2i\pi}\omega_i$ is the pullback of the class of $\frac{1}{2i\pi}\frac{dz}{z}$ which is known to be in the rational (and even integer) cohomology of $\mathbb{C}^*$, dual to the class of the loop $t \mapsto e^{2i\pi t}$ around 0.

All the differential forms in $R^\bullet(L)$ being closed, there is a well-defined map of graded algebras

$$v : R^\bullet(L) \to H^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L).$$

Theorem 2.5 (Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem)**.** *The maps u and v are isomorphisms of graded algebras:*

$$A_\bullet(L) \overset{u}{\underset{\simeq}{\longrightarrow}} R^\bullet(L) \overset{v}{\underset{\simeq}{\longrightarrow}} H^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L).$$

Remark 2.6. The fact that v is an isomorphism was conjectured by Arnol'd ([2]) and proven by Brieskorn ([4]). The fact that u is an isomorphism was proven by Orlik and Solomon ([15]). A proof may be found in [16], Theorems 3.126 and 5.89.

3. An abstract version of the Orlik-Solomon algebra

We fix an abelian $\mathbb{Q}$-linear category $\mathfrak{C}$. In the following sections, $\mathfrak{C}$ will be the category of $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces, or sheaves of $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces on a complex manifold, where $\mathbb{K}$ is $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, or the category of complexes in such a category.

3.1. **The definition.** Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Suppose that we are given, for any stratum Σ of the arrangement, an object S_Σ of $\mathfrak{C}$. For any $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ we then define $S_I = S_{L_I}$.

Let $I' \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ be a dependent subset, then for all $i \in I'$ such that $I' \setminus \{i\}$ is independent we have $L_{I' \setminus \{i\}} = L_{I'}$ for dimension reasons, hence $S_{I' \setminus \{i\}} = S_{I'}$. Thus we have a natural map

$$\rho_{I'} : S_{I'} \to \bigoplus_{\substack{i \in I' \\ I' \setminus \{i\} \text{ indep.}}} S_{I' \setminus \{i\}}$$

where we put the morphism $\operatorname{sgn}(\{i\}, I' \setminus \{i\})$ times the identity on the factor indexed by i. Let

$$\rho : \bigoplus_{I' \text{ dep.}} S_{I'} \to \bigoplus_{I \text{ indep.}} S_I$$

be the collection of all the $\rho_{I'}$'s for I' dependent. Then we define

$$\mathcal{S}(L) = \operatorname{coker}(\rho)$$

We will use the following abusive but more explicit notation:

$$\mathcal{S}(L) = \left(\bigoplus_{I \text{ indep.}} S_I \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

which means, when $\mathfrak{C}$ is a category of vector spaces, that we quotient by the vector space spanned by the images of the maps $\rho_{I'}$ for I' dependent. The notation $\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$ stands for Orlik-Solomon.

If $\mathfrak{C}$ is the category of $\mathbb{Q}$-vector spaces and $S_I = \mathbb{Q}e_I$ is one-dimensional for all I, then $\mathcal{S}(L)$ is the (vector space underlying the) Orlik-Solomon algebra $A_\bullet(L)$, in view of Lemma 2.1. Hence $\mathcal{S}(L)$ is an abstract analogue of the Orlik-Solomon algebra (however, there is no algebra structure in general).

As is the case for the Orlik-Solomon algebra, the objects $\mathcal{S}(L)$ have a finer structure. First, if we restrict the definition of ρ to subsets I' of cardinality $k+1$ and subsets I of cardinality k, we get a cokernel $\mathcal{S}_k(L)$ which is the analogue of $A_k(L)$, that we denote by

$$\mathcal{S}_k(L) = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=k \\ I \text{ indep.}}} S_I \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

and we have a direct sum decomposition

$$\mathcal{S}(L) = \bigoplus_k \mathcal{S}_k(L).$$

Let now Σ be a stratum of L. If we restrict the definition of ρ to the subsets I' and I such that $L_{I'} = L_I = \Sigma$, the cokernel is an object that we denote by $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L)$, which is the analogue of $A_\Sigma(L)$. We have a direct sum decomposition

$$\mathcal{S}_k(L) = \bigoplus_{\mathrm{codim}(\Sigma)=k} \mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L)$$

hence

$$\mathcal{S}(L) = \bigoplus_\Sigma \mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L)$$

3.2. **The nbc object.** In view of the nbc basis of the Orlik-Solomon algebra, we introduce the object

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}(L) = \bigoplus_{I \text{ nbc}} S_I.$$

We also have a direct sum decomposition

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}(L) = \bigoplus_\Sigma \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_\Sigma(L)$$

where $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_\Sigma(L)$ is the direct sum of the S_I's for I an nbc-set such that $L_I = \Sigma$.

We prove the abstract analogue of Lemma 2.2:

Proposition 3.1. *For any stratum Σ of L, the natural morphism $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_\Sigma(L) \to \mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L)$ is an isomorphism, hence the natural morphism $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}(L) \to \mathcal{S}(L)$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. In the framework of Orlik-Solomon algebras, let us denote by $p : \widetilde{A}_\Sigma(L) \to A_\Sigma(L)$ the natural morphism and $q : A_\Sigma(L) \to \widetilde{A}_\Sigma(L)$ the inverse morphism provided by Lemma 2.2. In the abstract framework, let us denote by $P : \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_\Sigma(L) \to \mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L)$ the natural morphism. We want to construct its inverse Q.
For an independent subset I such that $L_I = \Sigma$, write

$$q(e_I) = \sum_J a_{I,J} e_J \ , \ a_{I,J} \in \mathbb{Q}$$

where the sum is over the nbc-sets J such that $L_J = \Sigma$. The fact that q passes to the quotient imposes some relations among the $a_{I,J}$'s. More precisely, for any dependent I' and any nbc-set J such that $L_{I'} = L_J = \Sigma$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{i \in I' \\ I' \setminus \{i\} \text{ indep.}}} \mathrm{sgn}(\{i\}, I' \setminus \{i\}) a_{I' \setminus \{i\}, J} = 0$$

Now we note that for the sets I such that $L_I = \Sigma$, the objects S_I are the same object S_Σ. Hence we may define $Q : \mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L) \to \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_\Sigma(L)$ "by the same formula" as q, that is with components

$$S_I = S_\Sigma \xrightarrow{a_{I,J}} S_\Sigma = S_J$$

for I independent, and J an nbc-set, such that $L_I = L_J = \Sigma$. The relations above imply that Q passes to the quotient by $\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$.
The fact that $q \circ p$ is the identity of $\widetilde{A}_\Sigma(L)$ implies that for I and J nbc-sets such that $L_I = L_J = \Sigma$, we have $a_{I,J} = \delta_{\{I=J\}}$. This in turn implies that $Q \circ P$ is the identity of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_\Sigma(L)$. We prove in the same fashion that $P \circ Q$ is the identity of $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L)$. □

The above proposition implies that the definition of $\mathcal{S}(L)$ as a quotient is misleading, since $\mathcal{S}(L)$ is (in a somewhat non-canonical way) just a direct sum of some S_I's. Thus, our construction behaves well with respect to additive functors:

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be another $\mathbb{Q}$-linear abelian category and $F : \mathfrak{C} \to \mathfrak{D}$ be an $\mathbb{Q}$-linear additive functor. Then we have a natural isomorphism*

$$F\left(\left(\bigoplus_{I \text{ indep.}} S_I\right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}\right) \cong \left(\bigoplus_{I \text{ indep.}} F(S_I)\right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

Proof. This comes from the diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
F\left(\left(\bigoplus_{I \text{ indep.}} S_I\right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}\right) & \left(\bigoplus_{I \text{ indep.}} F(S_I)\right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}} \arrow[l] \\
F\left(\bigoplus_{I \text{ nbc}} S_I\right) \arrow[u, "\cong"] & \bigoplus_{I \text{ nbc}} F(S_I) \arrow[l, "\cong"'] \arrow[u, "\cong"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the vertical arrows are the isomorphisms given by Lemma 3.1. □

3.3. **Deletion and restriction.** Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^n$, L' and L'' the deletion and restriction of L with respect to the last hyperplane L_l. Because of Lemma 2.3 we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_k(L') \xrightarrow{i} \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_k(L) \xrightarrow{j} \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_{k-1}(L'') \to 0$$

where i is the natural inclusion and j is 0 on S_I if I does not contain l and the identification between S_I and $S_{\lambda(I\setminus\{l\})}$ if I contains l.

In view of Lemma 3.1, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_k(L') \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_k(L) \arrow[r, "j"] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_{k-1}(L'') \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathcal{S}_k(L') \arrow[r, "i"] & \mathcal{S}_k(L) \arrow[r, "j"] & \mathcal{S}_{k-1}(L'') \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Thus the bottom row of this diagram is a short exact sequence, which is the analogue of the deletion-restriction short exact sequence of §2.3. It does not depend on the choices of linear orderings.

4. LOGARITHMIC FORMS AND THE WEIGHT FILTRATION

We define and study the forms with logarithmic poles along a central hyperplane arrangement. As we will soon point out, our definition of the logarithmic complex is not standard. We define a weight filtration on the logarithmic complex. The main results are Theorem 4.10 which computes its graded pieces, and Theorem 4.13 which states that the logarithmic complex computes the cohomology of the complement of the hyperplane arrangement.

4.1. **The logarithmic complex.** Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^n$. We recall that we defined some differential forms $\omega_i = \frac{df_i}{f_i}$ for $i = 1, \cdots, l$, and $\omega_I = \omega_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_{i_k}$ for $I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\}$, which is zero if I is dependent.

Definition 4.1. A meromorphic form on $\mathbb{C}^n$ is said to have **logarithmic poles along** L if it is a linear combination over $\mathbb{C}$ of forms of the type $\eta \wedge \omega_I$ for some $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$, where η is a holomorphic form on $\mathbb{C}^n$.

We define $\Omega^p\langle L\rangle$ to be the $\mathbb{C}$-vector space of meromorphic p-forms on $\mathbb{C}^n$ with logarithmic poles along L. These forms are stable under the exterior differential and hence we get a complex $\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle$ that embeds into the complex of holomorphic forms on $\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L$:

$$\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \hookrightarrow \Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus L)$$

and which we call the **complex of logarithmic forms** of L.

Remark 4.2. This definition is not standard in the theory of hyperplane arrangements. In [16], following Saito ([18]), one defines a complex $\Omega^\bullet(\log L)$ in the following way. Let

$$Q = \prod_{i=1}^{l} f_i$$

be a defining polynomial for the arrangement. Then $\Omega^p(\log L)$ is the set of meromorphic p-forms ω on $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that $Q\omega$ and $Qd\omega$ are holomorphic.
We have an inclusion

$$\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \subset \Omega^\bullet(\log L)$$

which is an equality if and only if $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ is independent.

Example 4.3. In $\mathbb{C}^2$ with coordinates x and y, let $L_1 = \{x = 0\}$, $L_2 = \{y = 0\}$, $L_3 = \{x = y\}$. Then $Q = xy(x - y)$ and the closed form

$$\omega = \frac{dx \wedge dy}{xy(x-y)}$$

is in $\Omega^2(\log L)$. It is an easy exercise to check that ω is not in $\Omega^2\langle L\rangle$.

4.2. **Residues.** We briefly recall the notion of residue of a form with logarithmic poles along a central hyperplane arrangement. In the case of dimension $n = 1$, this is the usual Cauchy residue in complex analysis; the general notion of residue is due to Poincaré and Leray ([11]).

The proof of the following easy lemma is left to the reader.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and $L' = \{L_1, \cdots, L_{l-1}\}$ the deletion of L with respect to $L_l = \{f_l = 0\}$. Let ω be a meromorphic p-form on $\mathbb{C}^n$ with poles along L'. If $df_l \wedge \omega = 0$ then there exists a meromorphic $(p-1)$-form θ with poles along L' such that $\omega = df_l \wedge \theta$.*

Proposition 4.5. *Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and L' (resp. L'') the deletion (resp. the restriction) of L with respect to $L_l = \{f_l = 0\}$. Let ω be a p-form on $\mathbb{C}^n$ with logarithmic poles along L. Then there exists a $(p-1)$-form α and a p-form β, both of which have logarithmic poles along L', such that*

$$\omega = \alpha \wedge \omega_l + \beta$$

The restriction $\alpha_{|L_l}$ is independent of the choices. It is a $(p-1)$-form on L_l with logarithmic poles along L''.

Proof. Let us write

$$\omega = \sum_I \eta_I \wedge \omega_I$$

where the η_I's are holomorphic forms on $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then we can define

$$\alpha = \sum_{I' \subset \{1, \cdots, l-1\}} \eta_{I' \cup \{l\}} \wedge \omega_{I'} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \beta = \sum_{l \notin I} \eta_I \wedge \omega_I$$

which are logarithmic forms with poles along L'. We then have

$$\alpha_{|L_l} = \sum_{I' \subset \{1,\cdots,l-1\}} \eta_{I'\cup\{l\}|L_l} \wedge \omega_{\lambda(I')}$$

which is a logarithmic form on L_l with poles along L''. For the uniqueness statement it is enough to prove that if

$$\alpha \wedge \omega_l + \beta = 0$$

then $\alpha_{|L_l} = 0$.
Since $df_l \wedge \beta = 0$, by Lemma 4.4 there is a meromorphic $(p-1)$-form β' with poles along L' such that $\beta = df_l \wedge \beta'$. Now

$$0 = f_l\,(\alpha \wedge \omega_l + df_l \wedge \beta') = df_l \wedge \left((-1)^{p-1}\alpha + f_l\beta'\right)$$

so again by Lemma 4.4, there exists a meromorphic $(p-2)$-form β'' with poles along L' such that

$$(-1)^{p-1}\alpha + f_l\beta' = df_l \wedge \beta''.$$

Hence we have

$$\alpha = (-1)^{p-1}(df_l \wedge \beta'' - f_l\beta')$$

which is zero when restricted to $L_l = \{f_l = 0\}$. □

With the notations of the above proposition, we set

$$\mathrm{Res}_{L_l}(\omega) = 2i\pi\,\alpha_{|L_l}.$$

It is a meromorphic $(p-1)$-form on L_l with logarithmic poles along L'', called the **residue** of ω along L_l.

Remark 4.6. When taking iterated residues, one should note that they "do not commute" in general, even when this has a clear meaning. For example, if $L_1 = \{x = 0\}$, $L_2 = \{y = 0\}$, $L_3 = \{x = y\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and $\omega = \dfrac{dx}{x} \wedge \dfrac{dy}{y} \in \Omega^2\langle L\rangle$, we have $\mathrm{Res}_{L_2\cap L_3}\mathrm{Res}_{L_2}(\omega) = (2i\pi)^2$ and $\mathrm{Res}_{L_3\cap L_2}\mathrm{Res}_{L_3}(\omega) = 0$ because $\mathrm{Res}_{L_3}(\omega) = 0$.

It is easy to see that the residue gives a morphism of complexes

$$\mathrm{Res}_{L_l} : \Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \to \Omega^{\bullet-1}\langle L''\rangle$$

where L'' is the restriction of L with respect to L_l. For η a holomorphic form on $\mathbb{C}^n$, we have $\mathrm{Res}_{L_l}(\eta\wedge\omega_I) = 0$ if $I \subset \{1,\cdots,l-1\}$ and $\mathrm{Res}_{L_l}(\eta\wedge\omega_I) = 2i\pi\,\eta_{|L_l} \wedge \omega_{\lambda(I\setminus\{l\})}$ if $l \in I$.

We then have a sequence of morphisms of complexes

$$(\mathcal{R}) : \quad 0 \to \Omega^\bullet\langle L'\rangle \xrightarrow{i} \Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}_{L_l}} \Omega^{\bullet-1}\langle L''\rangle \to 0$$

where i is the natural inclusion. It is obvious from the definitions that $\mathrm{Res}_{L_l} \circ i = 0$, that i is injective and Res_{L_l} is surjective. We will prove in the next paragraph that $\ker(\mathrm{Res}_{L_l}) \subset \mathrm{Im}(i)$, so that the above sequence is a short exact sequence.

4.3. The weight filtration.

The following terminology is borrowed from P. Deligne ([6], 3.1.5).

Definition 4.7. For $k \geq 0$, we define $W_k\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \subset \Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle$ to be the subcomplex spanned by the forms that are of the type $\eta \wedge \omega_I$ with $|I| \leq k$, where η is a holomorphic form on $\mathbb{C}^n$. These subcomplexes define an ascending filtration

$$W_0\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \subset W_1\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \subset \cdots$$

on $\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle$ called the **weight filtration**.

We have $W_0\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle = \Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n)$ and $W_p\Omega^p\langle L\rangle = \Omega^p\langle L\rangle$.

By definition, the residue morphisms induce morphisms $\mathrm{Res}_{L_l} : W_k\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \to W_{k-1}\Omega^{\bullet-1}\langle L''\rangle$ which are easily seen to be surjective. Thus the sequence $(\mathcal{R})$ induces sequences

$$(W_k\mathcal{R}) : \quad 0 \to W_k\Omega^\bullet\langle L'\rangle \xrightarrow{i} W_k\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}_{L_l}} W_{k-1}\Omega^{\bullet-1}\langle L''\rangle \to 0 \tag{4}$$

and

$$(\mathrm{gr}_k^W\mathcal{R}): \quad 0 \to \mathrm{gr}_k^W\Omega^\bullet\langle L'\rangle \xrightarrow{i} \mathrm{gr}_k^W\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}_{L_l}} \mathrm{gr}_{k-1}^W\Omega^{\bullet-1}\langle L''\rangle \to 0 \tag{5}$$

We will prove that they are short exact sequences. For now, the only easy facts are that $(W_k\mathcal{R})$ is exact on the left and on the right, and that $(\mathrm{gr}_k^W\mathcal{R})$ is exact on the right.

The following lemma is easily proven by choosing appropriate coordinates on $\mathbb{C}^n$:

Lemma 4.8. *Let $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$, $|I| = k$, be an independent subset and η a holomorphic form on $\mathbb{C}^n$. If $\eta_{|L_I} = 0$ then $\eta \wedge \omega_I \in W_{k-1}\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle$.*

The following definition is a particular case of §3.1, with $\mathfrak{C}$ being the category of complexes of $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces, and $S_\Sigma = \Omega^{\bullet-k}(\Sigma)$.

Definition 4.9. For all k, we define $G_k^\bullet(L)$ as the quotient

$$G_k^\bullet(L) = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=k \\ I \text{ indep.}}} \Omega^{\bullet-k}(L_I)\right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

This is a complex of $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces. We define a morphism of complexes

$$\Phi : G_k^\bullet(L) \to \mathrm{gr}_k^W\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle$$

in the following way. For I independent of cardinality k, for $\eta \in \Omega^{\bullet-k}(L_I)$, we set

$$\Phi(\eta) = (2i\pi)^{-k}\widetilde{\eta} \wedge \omega_I$$

where $\widetilde{\eta} \in \Omega^{\bullet-k}(\mathbb{C}^n)$ is any form such that $\widetilde{\eta}_{|L_l} = \eta$. Lemma 4.8 implies that this does not depend on the choice of $\widetilde{\eta}$, and the resulting morphism passes to the quotient by $\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$ because the Orlik-Solomon relations are satisfied by the forms ω_I (Lemma 2.4). It is then easy to check that Φ is a morphism of complexes.

Theorem 4.10. *The morphism*

$$\Phi : G_k^\bullet(L) \to \mathrm{gr}_k^W\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle$$

is an isomorphism of complexes.

Proof. The surjectivity is trivial and we prove the injectivity by induction on the cardinal l of the arrangement.
For $l = 0$, the only nontrivial case is $k = 0$ and Φ is just the identity of $\Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n)$.
Suppose the statement is proven for arrangements of cardinality $\leq l - 1$ and take an arrangement L of cardinality l. We have a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & G_k^\bullet(L') \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"] & G_k^\bullet(L) \arrow[r, "j"] \arrow[d, "\Phi"] & G_{k-1}^{\bullet-1}(L'') \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\Phi"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{gr}_k^W\Omega^\bullet\langle L'\rangle \arrow[r, "i"] & \mathrm{gr}_k^W\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \arrow[r, "\mathrm{Res}_{L_l}"] & \mathrm{gr}_{k-1}^W\Omega^{\bullet-1}\langle L''\rangle \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the top row is the deletion-restriction exact sequence defined in §3.3 and the bottom row is the sequence $(\mathrm{gr}_k^W\mathcal{R})$. This diagram is easily seen to be commutative.
By the inductive hypothesis, the vertical arrows on the right and on the left are isomorphisms. Thus a diagram chase shows that the bottom row is exact in the middle.
Now the complexes (4) and (5) give rise to a short exact sequence of complexes

$$0 \to (W_{k-1}\mathcal{R}) \to (W_k\mathcal{R}) \to (\mathrm{gr}_k^W\mathcal{R}) \to 0$$

The long exact sequence in cohomology tells us that if $(W_{k-1}\mathcal{R})$ is exact in the middle then it is also the case for $(W_k\mathcal{R})$. Since $(W_0\mathcal{R})$ is just the sequence

$$0 \to \Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id}} \Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n) \to 0 \to 0$$

an induction on k shows that $(W_k\mathcal{R})$ is exact in the middle, hence a short exact sequence, for all k. Again, the long exact sequence in cohomology shows that $(\mathrm{gr}_k^W\mathcal{R})$ is also a short exact sequence for all k.
Thus, in the above commutative diagram, both rows are exact and a diagram chase (the 5-lemma) shows that the middle Φ is injective. This completes the induction and the proof of the theorem. ☐

Remark 4.11. The inverse morphism $\Psi : \mathrm{gr}_k^W\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \to G_k^\bullet(L)$ is given, for η holomorphic and I independent of cardinality k, by

$$\Psi(\eta\wedge\omega_I) = (2i\pi)^k\,\eta_{|L_I} \in \Omega^{\bullet-k}(L_I)$$

For $k=1$ this is exactly the definition of a residue, but for $k>1$ one should note that this has nothing to do with an "iterated residue" (see Remark 4.6).

As a corollary of the proof of Theorem 4.10 we get the following:

Theorem 4.12. *The sequences $(\mathcal{R})$, $(W_k\mathcal{R})$ and $(\mathrm{gr}_k^W\mathcal{R})$ are short exact sequences of complexes.*

Proof. The only thing that has to be noted is that $(\mathcal{R}) = (W_k\mathcal{R})$ for k large enough. ☐

4.4. **The comparison theorem.**

Theorem 4.13. *The inclusion $\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \hookrightarrow \Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n\setminus L)$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. Since $\mathbb{C}^n\setminus L$ is a smooth affine algebraic variety over $\mathbb{C}$, the cohomology of $\Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n\setminus L)$ gives the cohomology of $\mathbb{C}^n\setminus L$ with complex coefficients. Thus we have to prove that the natural map

$$H^p(\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle) \to H^p(\mathbb{C}^n\setminus L)\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{C}$$

is an isomorphism for all p.
Let us consider the spectral sequence associated to the filtered complex $(\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle, W)$. In view of Theorem 4.10 we have

$$E_0^{-p,q} = \mathrm{gr}_p^W\Omega^{-p+q}\langle L\rangle \cong G_p^{-p+q}(L) = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=p\\ I\text{ indep.}}}\Omega^{-2p+q}(L_I)\right)/\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

the differential being the exterior differential on forms. At the next page of the spectral sequence we get, in view of Lemma 3.2:

$$E_1^{-p,q} = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=p\\ I\text{ indep.}}} H^{-2p+q}(L_I)\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{C}\right)/\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

Since the L_I's are vector spaces, hence contractible, the only nonzero terms are

$$E_1^{-p,2p} = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=p\\ I\text{ indep.}}}\mathbb{C}e_I\right)/\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

where e_I is the canonical generator of $H^0(L_I,\mathbb{C})$. Thus, in view of Lemma 2.1, $E_1^{-p,2p}\cong A_p(L)\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{C}$.
For degree reasons, all the differentials in the pages E_1, E_2, etc are zero, hence the spectral sequence degenerates at E_1: $E_\infty = E_1$. Thus the only non-zero graded pieces of the cohomology of $\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle$ are

$$H^p(\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle) = \mathrm{gr}_p^W H^p(\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle) \cong E_\infty^{-p,2p} = E_1^{-p,2p} \cong A_p(L)\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{C}$$

hence the filtration W on $H^p(\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle)$ is trivial and we get an isomorphism $H^p(\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle)\cong A_p(L)\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{C}$ which by definition sends ω_I to $(2i\pi)^p e_I$ for $|I|=p$. Composing with the Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon isomorphism from Theorem 2.5 we get an isomorphism

$$H^p(\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle)\cong A_p(L)\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{C}\cong H^p(\mathbb{C}^n\setminus L)\otimes_{\mathbb{Q}}\mathbb{C}$$

which sends ω_I to its cohomology class, and the Theorem is proven. ☐

Remark 4.14. Since $(\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle, W)$ is a filtered differential graded algebra, there is an algebra structure on the spectral sequence considered in the proof of Theorem 4.13 and it is easy to check that the product

$$E_1^{-p,2p}\otimes E_1^{-p',2p'}\to E_1^{-(p+p'),2(p+p')}$$

is indeed the product on the Orlik-Solomon algebra, that is $e_I\otimes e_{I'}\mapsto \operatorname{sgn}(I,I')e_{I\cup I'}$.

Remark 4.15. Using the residue exact sequence (Theorem 4.12) and the exact sequence

$$0\to H^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n\setminus L')\to H^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n\setminus L)\to H^{\bullet-1}(L_l\setminus L'')\to 0$$

given by the Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem, one gets another proof of Theorem 4.13 by induction on the cardinality l of the arrangement, using the 5-lemma. We have chosen to present the above proof because it shows in a more transparent way the relationship between the weight filtration and the Orlik-Solomon algebra.

Remark 4.16. We have a chain of inclusions of complexes

$$\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle \overset{i_1}{\hookrightarrow} \Omega^\bullet(\log(L)) \overset{i_2}{\hookrightarrow} \Omega^\bullet(\mathbb{C}^n\setminus L)$$

where $\Omega^\bullet(\log(L))$ has been defined in Remark 4.2.
A conjecture by H. Terao ([19]) states that i_2 is a quasi-isomorphism. According to Theorem 4.13, the composite $i_2\circ i_1$ is a quasi-isomorphism, hence Terao's conjecture is equivalent to the fact that i_1 is a quasi-isomorphism. This is equivalent to the acyclicity of the quotient complex $\Omega^\bullet(\log(L))/\Omega^\bullet\langle L\rangle$.

5. The global case: hypersurface arrangements

We globalize the previous results for hypersurface arrangements. We write $\Delta=\{|z|<1\}\subset\mathbb{C}$ for the open unit disk and $\Delta^n\subset\mathbb{C}^n$ for the unit n-dimensional polydisk.

5.1. **Hypersurface arrangements.** Let X be a complex manifold. The following terminology is borrowed from P. Aluffi ([1]).

Definition 5.1. A set $L=\{L_1,\cdots,L_l\}$ of smooth hypersurfaces of X is a **hypersurface arrangement** if around each point of X we may find a system of local coordinates in which each L_i is defined by a linear equation. In other words, X is covered by charts $V\cong\Delta^n$ such that for all i, $L_i\cap V$ is the intersection of Δ^n with a linear hyperplane in $\mathbb{C}^n$.

As for central hyperplane arrangements, we implicitly fix a linear ordering on the hyperplanes. We use the same letter L to denote the union of the hypersurfaces:

$$L=\bigcup_{1\leq i\leq l}L_i.$$

The notion of hypersurface arrangement generalizes that of (simple) normal crossing divisor: a hypersurface arrangement is a normal crossing divisor if the local linear equations defining the L_i's are everywhere linearly independent. In other words, we can always choose local coordinates such that the irreducible components L_i are coordinate hyperplanes.

For a subset $I\subset\{1,\cdots,l\}$, the **stratum** of the hypersurface arrangement L indexed by I is

$$L_I=\bigcap_{i\in I}L_i$$

with the convention $L_\varnothing=X$. In the sequel we will make the following assumption on any hypersurface arrangement:

(Connectedness) All the strata L_I are connected.

A subset $I\subset\{1,\cdots,l\}$ is said to be **independent** if $L_I\neq\varnothing$ and $\operatorname{codim}(L_I)=|I|$, and **dependent** otherwise (that is, if $L_I=\varnothing$ or $\operatorname{codim}(L_I)<|I|$). By the connectedness assumption, these properties may be checked locally. More precisely we have the following lemma, whose proof is left to the reader:

Lemma 5.2. *If $L_I \neq \varnothing$, the following properties are equivalent:*

(i) *I is independent.*

(ii) *for every point $p \in L_I$, for every chart $V \cong \Delta^n$ centered in p in which all the L_i's are hyperplanes, I is independent when considered in V.*

(iii) *there exists a point $p \in L_I$ and a chart $V \cong \Delta^n$ centered in p in which all the L_i's are hyperplanes, such that I is independent when considered in V.*

Having defined the notion of an (in)dependent subset $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$, one can define the notion of **circuit**, **broken circuit** and **nbc-set** in the situation of a hypersurface arrangement, exactly as in §2.2. As in the above Lemma, these notions can be checked locally.

We may also globalize the construction of §3.1. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be an abelian $\mathbb{Q}$-linear category and suppose that we are given, for every stratum Σ of a hypersurface arrangement L, an object S_Σ of $\mathfrak{C}$, such that $S_\varnothing = 0$ if $\varnothing$ is a stratum of L. Then we define $S_I = S_{L_I}$ for $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ and set

$$\mathcal{S}(L) = \left(\bigoplus_{I \text{ indep.}} S_I \right) / \sim_{\text{OS}}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}(L) = \bigoplus_{I \text{ nbc}} S_I.$$

It has to be noted that in the definition of $\sim_{\text{OS}}$, the dependent subsets I' such that $L_{I'} = \varnothing$ are not taken into account.
As in the local case, we have direct sum decompositions indexed by the (non-empty) strata, and Proposition 3.1 is still true in the global setting:

Proposition 5.3. *The natural morphism $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}(L) \to \mathcal{S}(L)$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we fix a non-empty stratum Σ and show that the natural morphism $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_\Sigma(L) \to \mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L)$ is an isomorphism. All the relevant subsets $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ define the same stratum Σ. Let us fix a point $p \in \Sigma$, a chart $V \cong \Delta^n$ centered in p in which all the L_i's are hyperplanes. According to Lemma 5.2, $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_\Sigma(L)$ are equal to the same objects defined from the situation in V. Hence the morphism $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}_\Sigma(L) \to \mathcal{S}_\Sigma(L)$ is an isomorphism by Proposition 3.1. ☐

5.2. **The logarithmic complex.**

In this paragraph we globalize the definitions of the logarithmic complex and the weight filtration. As in the local case, we determine the graded parts of the logarithmic complex and prove a comparison theorem. This generalizes the case of normal crossing divisors, studied by Deligne in [6], 3.1.

Let X be a complex manifold and L a hypersurface arrangement. A meromorphic form on X is said to have **logarithmic poles along** L if it is locally a linear combination over $\mathbb{C}$ of forms of the type

$$\eta \wedge \frac{df_{i_1}}{f_{i_1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{df_{i_r}}{f_{i_r}} \tag{6}$$

with η holomorphic and the f_i's local defining (linear) equations for the L_i's.

The meromorphic forms on X with logarithmic poles along L form a complex of sheaves of $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces on X, that we denote by $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$. If $L = D$ is a normal crossing divisor, then $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,D\rangle} = \Omega^\bullet_X(\log D)$ as defined in [6], 3.1.

Remark 5.4. As already noted in Remark 4.2, the definition of $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$ does not agree with the definition of $\Omega^\bullet_X(\log L)$ given in [18] or other references. In general, our definition gives a smaller complex, although the two definitions are equivalent in the case of normal crossing divisors (and only in this case).

Now we define the **weight filtration** on $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$ exactly in the same fashion as in the local case: $W_k\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} \subset \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$ is the subcomplex of sheaves spanned by the forms that are locally of type (6) with $r \leq k$.

We have $W_0\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} = \Omega^\bullet_X$ and $W_p\Omega^p_{\langle X,L\rangle} = \Omega^p_{\langle X,L\rangle}$.

For all I we denote by $i_I : L_I \hookrightarrow X$ the closed immersion of the stratum L_I inside X.
We globalize the definition of $G^\bullet_k(L)$ from §4.3. Once again we apply the construction of 3.1, $\mathfrak{C}$ being the category of sheaves of $\mathbb{C}$-vector-spaces on X, and define:

$$\mathcal{G}^\bullet_k(X,L) = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=k \\ I \text{ indep.}}} (i_I)_*\Omega^{\bullet-k}_{L_I} \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

This is a complex of sheaves of $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces on X.

As in the local case, we may define a morphism of complexes of sheaves

$$\Phi : \mathcal{G}^\bullet_k(X,L) \to \mathrm{gr}^W_k \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$$

by putting

$$\Phi(\eta) = (2i\pi)^{-k}\, \widetilde{\eta} \wedge \frac{df_{i_1}}{f_{i_1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{df_{i_k}}{f_{i_k}}$$

for $I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\}$, $\eta \in \Omega^{\bullet-k}_{L_I}$ a local section, $\widetilde{\eta} \in \Omega^{\bullet-k}_X$ a local extension of η, and the f_i's local defining equations for the L_i's.
It has to be noted that this definition is independent from the choice of local equations for the L_i's. Indeed if we write $f'_i = f_i u_i$ with u_i a holomorphic function that is non-zero near the origin, then

$$\frac{df'_i}{f'_i} = \frac{df_i}{f_i} + \frac{du_i}{u_i}$$

with $\dfrac{du_i}{u_i}$ being a holomorphic 1-form near the origin, hence we have

$$\frac{df'_{i_1}}{f'_{i_1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{df'_{i_k}}{f'_{i_k}} = \frac{df_{i_1}}{f_{i_1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \frac{df_{i_k}}{f_{i_k}} \mod W_{k-1}\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$$

The following theorem is a global version of Theorem 4.10.

Theorem 5.5. *The morphism*

$$\Phi : \mathcal{G}^\bullet_k(X,L) \to \mathrm{gr}^W_k \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$$

is an isomorphism of complexes of sheaves of $\mathbb{C}$*-vector spaces.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that for every chart $V \cong \Delta^n$ on which L is a hyperplane arrangement, the morphism

$$\Gamma(V, \mathcal{G}^\bullet_k(X,L)) \to \Gamma(V, \mathrm{gr}^W_k \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle})$$

is an isomorphism. Since by Lemma 5.2 the property of being independent is local, this is exactly Theorem 4.10 with the ambient space $\mathbb{C}^n$ replaced by the polydisk Δ^n. One can check that the proof of Theorem 4.10 can be copied word for word in that local setting. □

Remark 5.6. The inverse morphism $\Psi : \mathrm{gr}^W_k \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} \to \mathcal{G}^\bullet_k(X,L)$ is given locally by the same formula as in Remark 4.11. As already noted, this should not be mistaken with an iterated residue, unless L is a normal crossing divisor (in this case, Deligne calls Ψ the Poincaré residue, see [6], 3.1.5.2).

Let $j : X \setminus L \hookrightarrow X$ be the open immersion of the complement of L inside X. The following theorem is a global version of Theorem 4.13:

Theorem 5.7. *The inclusion* $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} \hookrightarrow j_*\Omega^\bullet_{X\setminus L}$ *is a quasi-isomorphism.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that for every chart $V \cong \Delta^n$ on which L is a hyperplane arrangement, the morphism

$$\Gamma(V, \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}) \to \Gamma(V, j_*\Omega^\bullet_{X\setminus L}) = \Omega^\bullet(V \setminus V \cap L)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. This is exactly Theorem 4.13 with the ambient space $\mathbb{C}^n$ replaced by the polydisk Δ^n. One can check that the proof of Theorem 4.13 can be copied word for word in the local setting. The argument that the strata L_I are contractible has to be replaced by the fact that the local strata $\Delta^n \cap L_I$ are contractible (because they are polydisks). The Brieskorn-Orlik-Solomon theorem remains true in the local setting because the inclusion $\Delta^n \setminus \Delta^n \cap L \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n \setminus L$ is a retraction and hence induces an isomorphism in cohomology. □

6. A functorial mixed Hodge structure and the Gysin model

6.1. **Reminders on mixed Hodge complexes.** In this section we recall some facts on mixed Hodge complexes, defined by P. Deligne. The interested reader will find all the details in [7], 7.1, 8.1. Although the formalism of mixed Hodge complexes, notably the use of (filtered) derived categories, can seem cumbersome at first, it is a useful tool to put mixed Hodge structures on (hyper)cohomology groups of sheaves.

Let us recall that if $\mathfrak{C}$ is an abelian category, the **filtered derived category** $\mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}(\mathfrak{C})$ is obtained from the category of filtered (bounded from above) complexes $(K^\bullet, F)$ in $\mathfrak{C}$ after inverting the filtered quasi-isomorphisms. We also have the **bifiltered derived category** $\mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}_2(\mathfrak{C})$ where we start with bifiltered complexes $(K^\bullet, W, F)$. The letter W denotes an increasing filtration, and F denotes a decreasing filtration. If Y is a complex manifold and $\mathbb{K}$ is $\mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, then we write $\mathrm{D}^+(Y,\mathbb{K})$ ($\mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}(Y,\mathbb{K})$, $\mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}_2(Y,\mathbb{K})$) for the (filtered, bifiltered) derived category of sheaves of $\mathbb{K}$-vector spaces on Y.

Let Y be a complex manifold and w an integer. A **cohomological Hodge complex** of weight w on Y is a triple

$$\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q}, (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{C}, F), \alpha)$$

with $\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q} \in \mathrm{D}^+(Y,\mathbb{Q})$, $(\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{C}, F) \in \mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}(Y,\mathbb{C})$ and $\alpha : \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong \mathcal{K}_\mathbb{C}$ an isomorphism in $\mathrm{D}^+(Y,\mathbb{C})$, satisfying some conditions that basically mean that for all p the filtration F defines on $\mathbb{H}^p(\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q})$ a Hodge structure of weight $p+w$.

The following fact is a reformulation of classical Hodge theory: if Y is a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ (or more generally a compact Kähler manifold) then we have a cohomological complex

$$\mathcal{K}(Y) = (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q}(Y), (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{C}(Y), F), \alpha)$$

of weight $w = 0$ on Y consisting of

1. $\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q}(Y) = \mathbb{Q}_Y$, the constant sheaf.
2. $\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{C}(Y) = \Omega^\bullet_Y$ with the Hodge filtration $F^p\Omega^\bullet_Y = \Omega^{\geq p}_Y$.
3. the holomorphic Poincaré lemma $\alpha : \mathbb{Q}_Y \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{C}_Y \cong \Omega^\bullet_Y$.

If $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q}, (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{C}, F), \alpha)$ is a Hodge complex of weight w on Y and k is an integer, then we can define the translation

$$\mathcal{K}[k] = (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q}[k], (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{C}[k], F), \alpha[k])$$

which is a Hodge complex of weight $w+k$, and the tate Twist

$$\mathcal{K}(k) = (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(2i\pi)^k, (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{C}, F[k]), \alpha)$$

which is a Hodge complex of weight $w - 2k$.

Now if Y is any complex manifold, a **cohomological mixed Hodge complex** on Y is a triple

$$\mathcal{K} = ((\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{Q}, W), (\mathcal{K}_\mathbb{C}, W, F), \alpha)$$

with $(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}, W) \in \mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}(Y, \mathbb{Q})$, $(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{C}}, W, F) \in \mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}_2(Y, \mathbb{C})$ and $\alpha : (\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}, W) \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong (\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{C}}, W)$ an isomorphism in $\mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}(Y, \mathbb{C})$, such that for all k, the triple

$$\mathrm{gr}_k^W \mathcal{K} = (\mathrm{gr}_k^W \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}, (\mathrm{gr}_k^W \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{C}}, F), \mathrm{gr}_k^W \alpha)$$

is a Hodge complex of weight k on Y.

The following theorem ([7], 8.1.9) is the fundamental theorem of mixed Hodge complexes.

Theorem 6.1. *Let Y be a complex manifold and $\mathcal{K} = ((\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}, W), (\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{C}}, W, F), \alpha)$ a cohomological mixed Hodge complex on Y.*

1. *For all n, the filtration $W[-n]$ and the filtration F define a mixed Hodge structure on $\mathbb{H}^n(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}})$.*
2. *Let ${}_{\mathrm{w}}E$ be the cohomological spectral sequence defined by $(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}, W)$. Then for all (p, q), the filtration F induces on ${}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{-p,q} = \mathbb{H}^{-p+q}(\mathrm{gr}_p^W \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ a Hodge structure of weight q and the differentials $d_1^{-p,q}$ are morphisms of Hodge structures.*
3. *The spectral sequence ${}_{\mathrm{w}}E$ degenerates at E_2: ${}_{\mathrm{w}}E_2^{-p,q} = {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_{\infty}^{-p,q} = \mathrm{gr}_p^W \mathbb{H}^n(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}) = \mathrm{gr}_q^{W[-n]} \mathbb{H}^n(\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ for $n = -p + q$.*

6.2. **A functorial mixed Hodge structure.** Let X be a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ and L a hypersurface arrangement in X. We use the previous constructions to put a functorial mixed Hodge structure on the cohomology $H^\bullet(X \setminus L)$ of the complement, using the formalism of mixed Hodge complexes. This generalizes the case of normal crossing divisors, studied by Deligne in [6], 3.2, and summarized in terms of mixed Hodge complexes in [7], 8.1.8. We recall the notation $j : X \setminus L \hookrightarrow X$.

We define a triple

$$\mathcal{K}(X, L) = ((\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X, L), W), (\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{C}}(X, L), W, F), \alpha)$$

in the following way:

1. $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X, L) = Rj_*\mathbb{Q}_{X\setminus L}$ with the filtration $W = \tau$, the canonical filtration ([6], 1.4.6).
2. $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{C}}(X, L) = \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X, L\rangle}$ with the weight filtration W defined in the previous section, and the Hodge filtration F defined by
$$F^p \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} = \Omega^{\geq p}_{\langle X,L\rangle}$$
3. We have a chain of isomorphisms in $\mathrm{D}^+(X, \mathbb{C})$:
$$Rj_*\mathbb{Q}_{X\setminus L} \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong Rj_*\mathbb{C}_{X\setminus L} \cong j_*\Omega^\bullet_{X\setminus L} \cong \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}$$
the last one being the quasi-isomorphism of the comparison theorem 4.13.
Hence we have an isomorphism $(Rj_*\mathbb{Q}_{X\setminus L} \otimes \mathbb{C}, \tau) \cong (\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}, \tau)$ in $\mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}(X, \mathbb{C})$. Finally the identity gives a filtered quasi-isomorphism $(\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}, \tau) \cong (\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}, W)$, as follows from the same proof as in [6], 3.1.8, in view of the comparison theorem 4.13. This gives the isomorphism
$$\alpha : (Rj_*\mathbb{Q}_{X\setminus L}, \tau) \otimes \mathbb{C} \cong (\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle}, W)$$
in $\mathrm{D}^+\mathrm{F}(X, \mathbb{C})$.

Theorem 6.2. *The triple $\mathcal{K}(X, L)$ is a cohomological mixed Hodge complex on X, which is functorial with respect to the pair (X, L). It thus defines a functorial mixed Hodge structure on $\mathbb{H}^n(Rj_*\mathbb{Q}_{X\setminus L}) \cong H^n(X \setminus L)$ for all n.*

Here, functoriality means that given two pairs (X_1, L_1) and (X_2, L_2) with X_i a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ and L_i a hypersurface arrangement in X_i, given a morphism $f : X_1 \to X_2$ such that $f^{-1}(L_2) \subset L_1$ (that is to say, $f(X_1 \setminus L_1) \subset f(X_2 \setminus L_2)$), there is a morphism of cohomological mixed Hodge complexes on X_2:

$$\mathcal{K}(f) : \mathcal{K}(X_2, L_2) \to Rf_*(\mathcal{K}(X_1, L_1))$$

and we have $\mathcal{K}(g \circ f) = Rg_*(\mathcal{K}(f)) \circ \mathcal{K}(g)$ whenever this is meaningful.

Proof. Theorem 4.10 gives an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{gr}_k^W \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} \cong \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=k \\ I \text{ indep.}}} (i_I)_* \Omega^{\bullet-k}_{L_I} \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

A local computation as in [17], Lemma 4.9, shows that this isomorphism is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ if we take care of the Tate twists. In other words we have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{gr}_k^W \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} \arrow[r, "\cong"] & \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=k \\ I \text{ indep.}}} (i_I)_* \Omega^\bullet_{L_I} \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}} [-k] \\
\mathrm{gr}_k^\tau Rj_* \mathbb{C}_U \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[u, "\cong"] & \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=k \\ I \text{ indep.}}} (i_I)_* \mathbb{C}_{L_I} \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}} [-k] \arrow[u, "\cong"'] \\
\mathrm{gr}_k^\tau Rj_* \mathbb{Q}_U \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[u] & \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=k \\ I \text{ indep.}}} (i_I)_* \mathbb{Q}_{L_I} \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}} [-k](-k) \arrow[u]
\end{tikzcd}$$

To complete the proof it suffices to notice that the top row of this diagram is compatible with the Hodge filtrations. Hence, applying Proposition 5.3 we get

$$\mathrm{gr}_k^W \mathcal{K}(X,L) = \bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=k \\ I \text{ nbc}}} (i_I)_* \mathcal{K}(L_I)[-k](-k)$$

which is a cohomological Hodge complex of weight k.
Concerning functoriality, let $f : X_1 \to X_2$ be a morphism such that $f^{-1}(L_2) \subset L_1$. We have to check that f induces a pull-back morphism

$$\mathcal{K}(f) : \mathcal{K}(X_2, L_2) \to Rf_*(\mathcal{K}(X_1, L_1))$$

The only thing that one has to check is that the usual pull-back morphism on forms respects the forms with logarithmic poles and thus induces a morphism of complexes of sheaves

$$f^* : \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X_2, L_2\rangle} \to f_* \Omega^\bullet_{\langle X_1, L_1\rangle}$$

This follows easily from a local computation. ☐

The following theorem shows that the Hodge structures that we have just defined are indeed the functorial Hodge structures defined by Deligne.

Theorem 6.3. *Let U be a smooth quasi-projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$.*

1. *There exists a smooth projective variety X and an open immersion $U \hookrightarrow X$ such that the complement $L = X \setminus U$ is a hypersurface arrangement in X.*
2. *Given two such compactifications (X_1, L_1) and (X_2, L_2), the mixed Hodge structures on $H^\bullet(U)$ defined via (X_1, L_1) and (X_2, L_2) are the same.*
3. *The mixed Hodge structure on $H^\bullet(U)$ defined in Theorem 6.2 is the same as the mixed Hodge structure defined by Deligne in* [6].

Proof.

(1) This follows from Nagata's compactification theorem and Hironaka's resolution of singularities. In fact, we can assume that L is a normal crossing divisor.

(2) Using resolution of singularities, we can always embed U in a smooth projective variety X such that $X \setminus U = L$ is a simple normal crossing divisor (and hence a hypersurface arrangement), and such that there exists morphisms

$$(X_1, X_1 \setminus L_1) \leftarrow (X, X \setminus L) \to (X_2, X_2 \setminus L_2)$$

that are the identity on U. Hence by functoriality the two mixed Hodge structures are isomorphic to the mixed Hodge structure defined via (X, L).

(3) The claim follows from (2) and the fact that for a given U, one can always choose (X, L) such that L is a normal crossing divisor (using resolution of singularities).

□

6.3. **The Gysin spectral sequence.** Let X be a smooth projective variety and L a hypersurface arrangement in X. In the previous paragraph we defined a cohomological mixed Hodge complex on X that defines a mixed Hodge structure on the cohomology of $X \setminus L$. The general formalism of mixed Hodge complexes (Theorem 6.1) tells us that the **Gysin spectral sequence** ${}_{\mathrm{w}}E_r^{p,q}$ associated to the weight filtration degenerates at E_2. In this section we make the E_1 term explicit.

By definition we have

$$ {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{-p,q} = \mathbb{H}^{-p+q}(\mathrm{gr}_p^W \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X, L)) $$

From the proof of Theorem 6.2 we get an isomorphism

$$ \mathrm{gr}_p^W \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X, L) \cong \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=p \\ I \text{ indep.}}} \mathcal{K}_{\mathbb{Q}}(L_I) \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}} [-p](-p) $$

and thus Lemma 3.2 (which remains true in the global setting thanks to Lemma 5.3) allows us to deduce:

$$ {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{-p,q} = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=p \\ I \text{ indep.}}} H^{-2p+q}(L_I)(-p) \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}} $$

The next proposition unravels the algebra structure on the E_1 term.

Proposition 6.4. *The only non-zero components of the product*

$$ {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p,q} \otimes {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p',q'} \to {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p+p',q+q'} $$

are given, for $I \cap I' = \varnothing$, $I \cup I'$ independent, by

$$ H^{-2p+q}(L_I) \otimes H^{-2p'+q'}(L_{I'}) \to H^{-2p+q}(L_{I\cup I'}) \otimes H^{-2p'+q'}(L_{I\cup I'}) \xrightarrow{\cup} H^{-2(p+p')+(q+q')}(L_{I\cup I'}) $$

multiplied by the sign $(-1)^{pq'}\mathrm{sgn}(I, I')$. The above morphism is the composition of the restriction morphisms for the inclusion of $L_{I\cup I'}$ inside L_I and $L_{I'}$, followed by the cup-product on $L_{I\cup I'}$.

Proof. First step: we do the proof in the case where $L = D$ is a normal crossing divisor. In this case $\Omega^\bullet_{\langle X,L\rangle} = \Omega^\bullet_X(\log D)$ as defined in [6]. It is enough to do the proof for the cohomology with complex coefficients and hence leave the Tate twists aside. To work with explicit representatives we have to work with smooth forms. We sketch the argument, which can be found in a more complete form in [21], Proposition 8.34.

If Y is any complex manifold, let $\mathcal{A}^\bullet_Y$ be the complex of sheaves of smooth forms (with complex coefficients) on Y, and let $A^\bullet(Y)$ be the complex of global smooth forms on Y. The inclusion $\Omega^\bullet_Y \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}^\bullet_Y$ is a quasi-isomorphism.

We may define a complex of sheaves $\mathcal{A}^\bullet_X(\log D)$ on X whose sections are smooth forms which are locally linear combinations over $\mathbb{C}$ of forms $\eta \wedge \omega_I$ with η smooth. This complex is endowed with a weight filtration defined in the same way as for the holomorphic case. The inclusion $\Omega^\bullet_X(\log D) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}^\bullet_X(\log D)$ is then a filtered quasi-isomorphism. Besides, we have a commutative diagram of quasi-isomorphisms (the top horizontal arrow being an isomorphism):

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{gr}_k^W \Omega^\bullet_X(\log D) \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & \bigoplus_{|I|=k} (i_I)_* \Omega^{\bullet-k}_{D_I} \arrow[d, "\cong"] \\
\mathrm{gr}_k^W \mathcal{A}^\bullet_X(\log D) \arrow[r, "\cong"] & \bigoplus_{|I|=k} (i_I)_* \mathcal{A}^{\bullet-k}_{D_I}
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since the complexes $\mathcal{A}_X^\bullet(\log D)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{D_I}^\bullet$ are made of fine sheaves, we can take them as resolutions to compute the spectral sequence and hence work with closed smooth global forms. Let us write $A_X^\bullet(\log D)$ for the complex of global sections of $\mathcal{A}_X^\bullet(\log D)$.
For $i = 1, \cdots, l$ let $\eta_i \in A_X^1(\log D)$ be a $(1,0)$-form such that locally around D_i we have

$$\eta_i = \frac{1}{2i\pi}\frac{df_i}{f_i} \mod A^1(X)$$

where f_i is a local equation for D_i.
Let us fix a subset I of cardinality p and let α be a closed smooth $(-2p+q)$-form on D_I. We fix I' of cardinality p' and α' in the same way. In order to compute the product of the classes of α and α' in the spectral sequence we have to find representatives for α and α' in $A_X^{-p+q}(\log D)$ and $A_X^{-p'+q'}(\log D)$ respectively. Let $\widetilde{\alpha}$ be a smooth closed $(-2p+q)$-form on X such that $\widetilde{\alpha}_{|D_I} = \alpha$, and $\widetilde{\alpha}'$ the same for α', then representatives are given by

$$\omega = \widetilde{\alpha} \wedge \eta_I \quad \text{ and } \quad \omega' = \widetilde{\alpha}' \wedge \eta_{I'}$$

respectively. We then look at the form

$$\omega \wedge \omega' = (\widetilde{\alpha} \wedge \eta_I) \wedge (\widetilde{\alpha}' \wedge \eta_{I'}) = (-1)^{pq'} \widetilde{\alpha} \wedge \widetilde{\alpha}' \wedge \eta_I \wedge \eta_{I'}$$

If $I \cap I' \neq \varnothing$, then $\eta_I \wedge \eta_{I'} = 0$ in $A_X^{-(p+p')+(q+q')}(\log D)$. Else, $\eta_I \wedge \eta_{I'} = \mathrm{sgn}(I, I')\eta_{I \cup I'}$ and the product we are looking for is

$$(-1)^{pq'}\mathrm{sgn}(I, I')(\widetilde{\alpha} \wedge \widetilde{\alpha}')_{|D_{I\cup I'}} = (-1)^{pq'}\mathrm{sgn}(I, I')\alpha_{|D_{I\cup I'}} \wedge \alpha'_{|D_{I\cup I'}}$$

hence the result.
Second step: We deduce the general case from the functoriality of the Gysin spectral sequence. Let us write $J = I \cup I'$ and let $L(J) = \bigcup_{j\in J} L_j$, which is a hypersurface arrangement in X. From the functoriality of the spectral sequence, there is a map of spectral sequences

$${}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p,q}(X, L(J)) \to {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p,q}(X, L)$$

which is easily seen to be injective. Hence the product of elements in $H^{-2p+q}(L_I)$ and $H^{-2p'+q'}(L_{I'})$ can be read off ${}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p,q}(X, L(J))$. If $L(J)$ is not a normal crossing divisor, then there is no independent subset of J of cardinal $p + p'$, hence ${}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p+p',q+q'}(X, L(J)) = 0$ and the product is zero. Hence we are reduced to the first step. ☐

Proposition 6.5. *The differential* $d_1 : {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{-p,q} \to {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{-p+1,q}$ *is induced by the Gysin morphisms*

$$H^{-2p+q}(L_I)(-p) \to H^{-2p+q+2}(L_{I\setminus\{i\}})(-p+1)$$

of the inclusions $L_I \hookrightarrow L_{I\setminus\{i\}}$ *for* I *independent of cardinality* p*, multiplied by the sign* $(-1)^{q-1}\mathrm{sgn}(\{i\}, I \setminus \{i\})$.

Proof. First step: If $L = D$ is a normal crossing divisor, this is Proposition 8.34 in [21] (see also [17], Proposition 4.7, or [14]).
Second step: We deduce the general case from the functoriality of the Gysin spectral sequence. Let $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ be an independent subset and let us write $L(I) = \bigcup_{i\in I} L_i$, which is a normal crossing divisor in X. From the functoriality of the spectral sequence, there is a map of spectral sequences

$${}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p,q}(X, L(I)) \to {}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p,q}(X, L)$$

which is easily seen to be injective. Hence the differential of an element in $H^{-2p+q}(L_I)$ can be read off ${}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{p,q}(X, L(I))$. We are then reduced to the first step. ☐

Remark 6.6. If X is just a compact complex manifold, then we can also consider the Gysin spectral sequence converging to the cohomology of $X \setminus L$, and the formulas for the E_1 term remain valid. The only thing that we gain when assuming that X is a projective variety is the degeneracy of this spectral sequence at the E_2 term, by Theorem 6.1.

6.4. **The Gysin model and the main theorem.** We restate the results of the previous section. Let

$$M_q^n(X,L) = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{|I|=q-n \\ I \text{ indep.}}} H^{2n-q}(L_I)(n-q) \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$$

viewed as a Hodge structure of weight q.

We define a *product* $M_q^n(X,L) \otimes M_{q'}^{n'}(X,L) \to M_{q+q'}^{n+n'}(X,L)$ by

$$H^{2n-q}(L_I) \otimes H^{2n'-q'}(L_{I'}) \to H^{2n-q}(L_{I\cup I'}) \otimes H^{2n'-q'}(L_{I\cup I'}) \xrightarrow{\cup} H^{2(n+n')-(q+q')}(L_{I\cup I'})$$

for $I \cap I' = \varnothing$, $I \cup I'$ independent, multiplied by the sign $(-1)^{(n-q)q'}\mathrm{sgn}(I,I')$. The above morphism is the composition of the restriction morphisms for the inclusion of $L_{I\cup I'}$ inside L_I and $L_{I'}$, followed by the cup-product on $L_{I\cup I'}$.

We define a *differential* $d : M_q^n(X,L) \to M_q^{n+1}(X,L)$ by the Gysin morphisms

$$H^{2n-q}(L_I)(n-q) \to H^{2n-q+2}(L_{I\setminus\{i\}})(n-q+1)$$

of the inclusions $L_I \hookrightarrow L_{I\setminus\{i\}}$ for I independent of cardinality $q-n$, multiplied by the sign $(-1)^q\mathrm{sgn}(\{i\}, I\setminus\{i\})$.

Remark 6.7. If $L = D$ is a normal crossing divisor then we simply have

$$M_q^n(X,D) = \bigoplus_{|I|=q-n} H^{2n-q}(D_I)(n-q).$$

Remark 6.8. Our definition depends on the linear order chosen on the irreducible components of the hypersurface arrangement L. However, if $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_l$ is a permutation and $\sigma.L$ the relabeling of L induced by σ, we leave it to the reader to define a natural isomorphism

$$M^\bullet(X,L) \xrightarrow{\cong} M^\bullet(X,\sigma.L)$$

In the next theorem, a **split mixed Hodge structure** is a mixed Hodge structure that is a direct sum of pure Hodge structures.
Recall that a graded algebra $B = \oplus_{n\geq 0} B_n$ is said to be graded-commutative if for homogeneous elements x and x' in B we have $xx' = (-1)^{|x||x'|}x'x$.

Theorem 6.9. *Let X be a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ and L a hypersurface arrangement in X.*

1. *The direct sum $M^\bullet(X,L) = \bigoplus_q M_q^\bullet(X,L)$ is a graded-commutative differential graded algebra in the category of split mixed Hodge structures.*
2. *We have isomorphisms of algebras in the category of split mixed Hodge structures:*

   $$H^\bullet(M^\bullet(X,L)) \cong \mathrm{gr}^W H^\bullet(X\setminus L)$$

   They are functorial with respect to the pair (X,L).

Here, functoriality means that given two pairs (X_1,L_1) and (X_2,L_2) with X_i a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ and L_i a hypersurface arrangement in X_i, given a morphism $f : X_1 \to X_2$ such that $f^{-1}(L_2) \subset L_1$ (that is to say, $f(X_1\setminus L_1) \subset f(X_2 \setminus L_2)$), there is a morphism of differential graded algebras in the category of split mixed Hodge structures:

$$M^\bullet(f) : M^\bullet(X_2,L_2) \to M^\bullet(X_1,L_1)$$

and we have $M^\bullet(g\circ f) = M^\bullet(f)\circ M^\bullet(g)$ whenever this is meaningful. Besides, $M^\bullet(f)$ and the usual pull-back $f^* : H^\bullet(X_2\setminus L_2) \to H^\bullet(X_1\setminus L_1)$ are compatible with the isomorphism of the above theorem.

Proof. (1) Note that we have multiplied the differential by -1 for more comfort; this gives an isomorphic differential graded algebra. The assertion is a consequence of the previous paragraph. However, it is an interesting exercise to prove by hand that the product and the differential pass to the quotient by $\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$ and define a structure of graded-commutative differential graded algebra on $M^\bullet(X,L)$. For example, the compatibility between the differential and the product is a consequence of the projection formula in cohomology.

(2) The isomorphism is just, after the change of variables $n = -p+q$, the fact that the spectral sequence ${}_{\mathrm{w}}E_r^{p,q}$ degenerates at E_2 and converges to the cohomology of $X \setminus L$:

$$H^p({}_{\mathrm{w}}E_1^{-\bullet,q}) \cong \mathrm{gr}_q^W H^{-p+q}(X \setminus L)$$

The functoriality is a consequence of the functoriality of the mixed Hodge complexes $\mathcal{K}(X, L)$ (Theorem 6.2).

□

7. Wonderful compactifications and the Gysin model

7.1. **Blow-ups of strata and wonderful compactifications.**

Definition 7.1. Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a central hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^n$, Σ a stratum of L. We say that Σ is a **good stratum** if there exists a direct sum decomposition $\mathbb{C}^n = \Sigma \oplus U$ such that the hyperplanes L_i that do not contain Σ contain U. We say that Σ is a **very good stratum** if furthermore the hyperplanes L_i that do not contain Σ are independent.

In other words, Σ is a good stratum if there exists coordinates $(z_1, \cdots, z_n)$ on $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\Sigma = \{z_1 = \cdots = z_r = 0\}$ for some r, and for each $i = 1, \cdots, l$, L_i is either of the type $\{a_1 z_1 + \cdots + a_r z_r = 0\}$ or of the type $\{a_{r+1} z_{r+1} + \cdots + a_n z_n = 0\}$. It is a very good stratum if furthermore we can choose the coordinates so that the hyperplanes of the second type are among $\{z_{r+1} = 0\}, \cdots, \{z_n = 0\}$.

Example 7.2. (1) The stratum $\{0\}$ is very good.

(2) In $\mathbb{C}^3$, let $L_1 = \{x = 0\}$, $L_2 = \{y = 0\}$, $L_3 = \{z = 0\}$, $L_4 = \{x = y\}$. Then the stratum $\{x = y = 0\}$ is very good. The stratum $\{z = 0\}$ is good, but not very good. The stratum $\{x = z = 0\}$ is not good.

Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a hypersurface arrangement in a complex manifold X, Σ a non-empty stratum of L. We say that Σ is a **good stratum** (resp. a **very good stratum**) if in every local chart where the L_i's are hyperplanes, it is a good stratum (resp. a very good stratum) in the sense of the above definition. A stratum of dimension 0 (a point) is always very good. In the case of a normal crossing divisor, all non-empty strata are very good.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $L = \{L_1, \cdots, L_l\}$ be a hypersurface arrangement in a complex manifold X, Σ a good stratum of L, and*

$$\pi : \widetilde{X} \to X$$

the blow-up of X along Σ. Let $E = \pi^{-1}(\Sigma)$ be the exceptional divisor, and for all i, let $\widetilde{L}_i$ be the strict transform of L_i. Then $\widetilde{L} = \{E, \widetilde{L}_1, \cdots, \widetilde{L}_l\}$ is a hypersurface arrangement in $\widetilde{X}$.

Proof. It is enough to do the proof for $X = \Delta^n$ and the L_i's hyperplanes. We choose coordinates $(z_1, \cdots, z_n)$ such that $\Sigma = \{z_1 = \cdots = z_r = 0\}$ and for each $i = 1, \cdots, l$, L_i is either of the type $\{a_1 z_1 + \cdots + a_r z_r = 0\}$ or $\{a_{r+1} z_{r+1} + \cdots + a_n z_n = 0\}$.
We have r natural local charts $\widetilde{X}_k \cong \Delta^n$ on $\widetilde{X}$, $k = 1, \cdots, r$. On the chart $\widetilde{X}_k$, the blow-up morphism is given by

$$\pi(z_1, \cdots, z_n) = (z_1 z_k, \cdots, z_{k-1} z_k, z_k, z_{k+1} z_k, \cdots, z_r z_k, z_{r+1}, \cdots, z_n)$$

In this chart, E is defined by the equation $z_k = 0$. The strict transform of a hyperplane of the type $\{a_1 z_1 + \cdots + a_r z_r = 0\}$ is given by the equation $a_1 z_1 + \cdots + a_{k-1} z_{k-1} + a_k + a_{k+1} z_{k+1} + \cdots + a_r z_r = 0$. The strict transform of a hyperplane of the type $\{a_{r+1} z_{r+1} + \cdots + a_n z_n = 0\}$ is defined by the same equation.
To sum up, in the chart $\widetilde{X}_k$, all the hypersurfaces of $\widetilde{L}$ are given by affine equations. Up to some translations, we can then find smaller charts where all the equations are linear. This completes the proof. □

With the notations of the above lemma, we will simply write that

$$\pi : (\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L}) \to (X, L)$$

is the blow-up of the pair (X, L) along the good stratum Σ. We stress the fact that $\widetilde{L}$ is the hypersurface arrangement consisting of the exceptional divisor E and all the proper transforms $\widetilde{L}_i$ of the hypersurfaces L_i.

The blow-ups along good strata (and in fact, of very good strata) are enough to resolve the singularities of a hypersurface arrangement, as the following theorem shows.

Theorem 7.4. *Let L be a hypersurface arrangement in a complex manifold X. There exists a sequence*

$$(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L}) = (X^{(N)}, L^{(N)}) \xrightarrow{\pi_N} (X^{(N-1)}, L^{(N-1)}) \xrightarrow{\pi_{N-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\pi_1} (X^{(0)}, L^{(0)}) = (X, L)$$

where

1. *for all k, $X^{(k)}$ is a complex manifold and $L^{(k)}$ a hypersurface arrangement in $X^{(k)}$*
2. *for all k, $\pi_k : (X^{(k)}, L^{(k)}) \to (X^{(k-1)}, L^{(k-1)})$ is the blow-up of $(X^{(k-1)}, L^{(k-1)})$ along a very good stratum of $L^{(k-1)}$*
3. *$\widetilde{L}$ is a normal crossing divisor in $\widetilde{X}$.*

Proof. We use the blow-up procedure described by Y. Hu in [9]. Such a procedure has become standard, so we do not give too many details. One may notice that Hu works with algebraic varieties, even though his results are valid in the framework of complex manifolds. The reader may assume that X is a smooth algebraic variety over $\mathbb{C}$, and the L_i's are algebraic. The sequence of blow-ups is the following:
(0) We first blow up all the strata of dimension 0 (the points).
(1) We then blow up all the strict transforms of the strata of dimension 1 (the lines).
· · ·
(d) We blow up all the strict transforms of the strata of dimension d.
· · ·
It has to be noted that at step (d), all the centers are pairwise disjoint, so that we may blow them up in any order. We want to prove that all the centers that appear in this blow-up procedure are very good strata.
At step (0), it is clear since the points are always very good strata. Suppose now that we are at step (d) with $d \geq 1$. For every stratum C of L of dimension $\leq d-1$, we have added an exceptional divisor $\widetilde{C}$. Let Σ be a stratum of L of dimension d, we want to prove that its strict transform $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ is a good stratum.
For $i = 1, \cdots, l$, if $\widetilde{\Sigma} \cap L_i \neq \varnothing$, then it is easy to see that $\Sigma \subset L_i$, so that $\widetilde{\Sigma} \subset \widetilde{L}_i$.
For C a stratum of L of dimension $\leq d-1$, if $\widetilde{\Sigma} \cap \widetilde{C} \neq \varnothing$, then $C \subset \Sigma$, hence we only have to consider the strict transforms of the strata of L contained in Σ. According to [9], Theorem 1.1, at each point of Σ we only have to consider those fitting into a certain flag $C_1 \subset C_2 \subset \cdots \subset C_k \subset \Sigma$. The result then follows from a local computation on the iterated blow-up of a flag of subspaces in $\mathbb{C}^n$. ☐

Remark 7.5. In the above proof, we have described a particular blow-up procedure. As has been known since the works of De Concini-Procesi ([5]) and Fulton-MacPherson ([8]), recently generalized by L. Li ([13]), there are lots of other blow-up strategies that can be applied. The beautiful combinatorial notion of a building set is very useful to understand the multiplicity of such strategies. Those sequences of blow-ups are sometimes referred to as "wonderful compactifications".

7.2. **Blow-ups of strata and the Gysin model.** Let us consider a sequence of blow-ups along (very) good strata as in Theorem 7.4:

$$(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L}) = (X^{(N)}, L^{(N)}) \xrightarrow{\pi_N} (X^{(N-1)}, L^{(N-1)}) \xrightarrow{\pi_{N-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\pi_1} (X^{(0)}, L^{(0)}) = (X, L)$$

Then by the functoriality of the Gysin model we get a sequence of morphisms of dga's (in the category of split mixed Hodge structures):

$$M^\bullet(X, L) = M^\bullet(X^{(0)}, L^{(0)}) \overset{M^\bullet(\pi_1)}{\xrightarrow{\sim}} \cdots \overset{M^\bullet(\pi_{N-1})}{\xrightarrow{\sim}} M^\bullet(X^{(N-1)}, L^{(N-1)}) \overset{M^\bullet(\pi_N)}{\xrightarrow{\sim}} M^\bullet(X^{(N)}, L^{(N)}) = M^\bullet(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$$

For each k, $M^\bullet(\pi_k)$ is a quasi-isomorphism since π_k induces an isomorphism $X^{(k)} \setminus L^{(k)} \xrightarrow{\simeq} X^{(k-1)} \setminus L^{(k-1)}$.
Thus we get a natural quasi-isomorphism between the Gysin model of (X, L) and that of $(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$.
In the following theorem, we investigate the case of a single blow-up and give explicit formulas.

Theorem 7.6. *Let X be a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ and L a hypersurface arrangement in X. Let Σ be a good stratum of L and*

$$\pi : (\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L}) \to (X, L)$$

the blow-up of (X, L) along Σ. Let

$$M^\bullet(\pi) : M^\bullet(X, L) \to M^\bullet(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$$

be the morphism induced by π on the Gysin models. Then

1. *$M^\bullet(\pi)$ is a quasi-isomorphism.*
2. *the components of $M^n_q(\pi)$ are given, for I independent of cardinality $q - n$, by*
   - *(a) the usual pull-back $H^{2n-q}(L_I) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H^{2n-q}(\widetilde{L}_I)$*
   - *(b) for all $i \in I$ such that $\Sigma \subset L_i$, the morphism $H^{2n-q}(L_I) \to H^{2n-q}(E \cap \widetilde{L}_{I\setminus\{i\}})$ which is the restriction on $\Sigma \cap L_{I\setminus\{i\}}$ followed by the pull-back by π, multiplied by the sign* $\operatorname{sgn}(\{i\}, I \setminus \{i\})$.

Proof. (1) This is obvious by Theorem 6.9, since π induces an isomorphism $\widetilde{X} \setminus \widetilde{L} \xrightarrow{\simeq} X \setminus L$.

(2) *First step*: We do the proof in the case where $L = D$ is a normal crossing divisor. We keep the notations of the proof of Proposition 6.4. Let $I \subset \{1, \cdots, l\}$ be an independent subset and $\alpha \in A^{2n-q}(D_I)$ a closed smooth form. Let $\widetilde{\alpha} \in A^{2n-q}(X)$ such that $\widetilde{\alpha}_{|D_I} = \alpha$. Then a representative for α in $A^n_X(\log D)$ is given by the form

$$\omega = \widetilde{\alpha} \wedge \eta_I$$

For $i = 1, \cdots, l$, let $\nu_i \in A^1_{X}(\log D)$ be a $(1,0)$-form such that locally around $\widetilde{D}_i$ we have

$$\nu_i = \frac{1}{2i\pi} \frac{d\widetilde{f}_i}{\widetilde{f}_i} \mod A^1(\widetilde{X})$$

where $\widetilde{f}_i$ is a local equation for $\widetilde{D}_i$.

Let $\nu_E \in A^1_X(\log D)$ playing the same role for E. Then a simple local computation using the formulas of Lemma 7.3 shows that we have the equality modulo $A^1(\widetilde{X})$:

$$\pi^*(\eta_i) = \begin{cases} \nu_i & \text{if } D_i \text{ does not contain } \Sigma \\ \nu_E + \nu_i & \text{if } D_i \text{ contains } \Sigma \end{cases}$$

Hence we get the equality in $\operatorname{gr}^W_{q-n} A^n_X(\log D)$:

$$\pi^*(\omega) = \pi^*(\widetilde{\alpha}) \wedge \nu_I + \sum_{\substack{i \in I \\ \Sigma \subset D_i}} \operatorname{sgn}(\{i\}, I \setminus \{i\}) \pi^*(\widetilde{\alpha}) \wedge \nu_E \wedge \nu_{I\setminus\{i\}}$$

Its image in $A^{2n-q}(\widetilde{D}_I)$ is $\pi^*(\widetilde{\alpha})_{|\widetilde{D}_I} = (\pi \circ \widetilde{i}_I)^*(\widetilde{\alpha})$ where $\widetilde{i}_I : \widetilde{D}_I \hookrightarrow \widetilde{X}$ is the closed immersion. Let us write $\pi_I : \widetilde{D}_I \to L_I$ the restriction of π. Then we have $\pi \circ \widetilde{i}_I = i_I \circ \pi_I$, and then

$$\pi^*(\widetilde{\alpha})_{|\widetilde{D}_I} = \pi_I^*(i_I^*(\widetilde{\alpha})) = \pi_I^*(\alpha)$$

hence the first part of the result. The second part follows from the same kind of computation.

Second step: We deduce the general case from the functoriality of the Gysin spectral sequence. Let I be an independent subset and write $L(I) = \bigcup_{i \in I} L_i$, which is a normal crossing divisor in $\widetilde{X}$. Let us write $\widetilde{L}(I) = E \cup \bigcup_{i\in I} \widetilde{L}_i$, which is a normal crossing divisor in $\widetilde{X}$. From the functoriality of the spectral sequence, there are maps of differential graded algebras

$$M^\bullet(X, L(I)) \to M^\bullet(X, L) \quad \text{and} \quad M^\bullet(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L}(I)) \to M^\bullet(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L})$$

which are easily seen to be injective. These maps fit into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M^\bullet(X, L) \arrow[r, "M^\bullet(\pi)"] & M^\bullet(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L}) \\
M^\bullet(X, L(I)) \arrow[u] \arrow[r, "M^\bullet(\pi)"] & M^\bullet(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{L}(I)) \arrow[u]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Thus the formula for $M^\bullet(\pi)$ on $H^{2n-q}(L_I)$ can be read off the bottom row, and we are reduced to the first step.

□

8. CONFIGURATION SPACES OF POINTS ON CURVES

8.1. **Configuration spaces associated to graphs.** Let Y be a smooth projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$, and $n \geq 1$ an integer. The configuration space of n ordered points on Y is by definition

$$C(Y,n) = \{(y_1, \cdots, y_n) \in Y^n \mid y_i \neq y_j \text{ for } i \neq j\} = Y^n \setminus \bigcup_{i<j} \Delta_{i,j}$$

where $\Delta_{i,j} = \{y_i = y_j\}$ is a diagonal.

As a natural generalization, we can consider the space obtained from Y^n after deleting only certain diagonals $\Delta_{i,j}$. We use graphs to parametrize such spaces.

Let Γ be a finite unoriented graph with no multiple edges and no self-loops, with V its set of vertices and E its set of edges. Let Y^V be the cartesian power of Y indexed by V, with coordinates y_v. For $v \in V$, we have a projection

$$p_v : Y^V \to Y$$

Every edge $e \in E$ with endpoints v and v' defines a diagonal

$$\Delta_e = \{y_v = y_{v'}\} \subset Y^V$$

which is the locus where the coordinates corresponding to the two endpoints of e are equal. We define

$$\Delta_\Gamma = \bigcup_{e\in E} \Delta_e$$

and then the configuration space of points on Y associated to Γ:

$$C(Y,\Gamma) = Y^V \setminus \Delta_\Gamma$$

In the case where Γ is the complete graph on n vertices, we recover the configuration space $C(Y,n)$.

In the rest of §8, we focus on the case where Y is a smooth projective curve, i.e. has dimension 1.

8.2. **A model for the cohomology.** In [10] and [20], I. Kriz and B. Totaro independently found a model for the cohomology of $C(Y,n)$. Their result has been recently generalized to $C(Y,\Gamma)$ by S. Bloch in [3] (even though Bloch's framework is slightly more general, with external edges in Γ labeled by points of Y). We recall the definition of this model. Here Y still has dimension 1, but the general definition is similar.

If $B = \oplus_{n\geq 0} B_n$ is a graded-commutative graded algebra and $\{x_\alpha\}$ are indeterminates with prescribed degrees $\{d_\alpha\}$, then there is a well-defined notion of graded-commutative algebra generated by the x_α's over B. This is a graded-commutative graded algebra which is the quotient of $B[\{x_\alpha\}]$ by the relations $bx_\alpha = (-1)^{|b|d_\alpha} x_\alpha b$ for b homogeneous, and $x_\beta x_\alpha = (-1)^{d_\alpha d_\beta} x_\alpha x_\beta$ for all α and β. For example, if B is a field concentrated in degree 0 then we recover the exterior algebra generated by the x_α's. We use the wedge notation $x_\alpha \wedge x_\beta$ to remember the graded-commutativity property.

Let us define, following [3], a graded-commutative dga $N^\bullet(Y,\Gamma)$ in the following way. It is generated (as a graded-commutative algebra) by the cohomology $H^\bullet(Y^V)$ and elements G_e in degree 1 for every edge $e \in E$, modulo the relations:

(R1) $p_v^*(c)G_e = p_{v'}^*(c)G_e$ for every class $c \in H^\bullet(Y)$, where v and v' are the endpoints of e in Γ.

(R2) $\sum_{i=1}^r (-1)^{i-1} G_{e_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{G_{e_i}} \wedge \cdots \wedge G_{e_r} = 0$ if $\{e_1, \cdots, e_r\} \subset E$ contains a loop.

In order to define a differential on $N^\bullet(Y,\Gamma)$ we need a lemma, which generalizes the above relation (R1).

Lemma 8.1. *For a finite set T and a map $u : T \to V$, we write $P_u : Y^V \to Y^T$ for the map induced by u, whose t-th component is $p_{u(t)}$ for $t \in T$. Let $I \subset E$ and let $u, u' : T \to V$ such that for all $t \in T$, the vertices $u(t)$ and $u'(t)$ are linked by a path in Γ made of edges in I. Then for all $c \in H^\bullet(Y^T)$ we have the relation*

$$P_u^*(c)G_I = P_{u'}^*(c)G_I$$

in $N^\bullet(Y, \Gamma)$.

In the case where $I = \{e\}$ is made of a single edge, $T = \{1\}$, $u(1)$ and $u'(1)$ are the endpoints of e, then the above Lemma is nothing but the relation (R1) in the definition of $N^\bullet(Y, \Gamma)$.

Proof. We write $T = \{1, \cdots, k\}$. Thanks to the Künneth formula we may write the cohomology class c as

$$c = \sum c_{i_1} \cdots c_{i_k}$$

with $c_{i_r} \in H^\bullet(Y)$, so that

$$P_u^*(c) = \sum_{r=1}^{k} p_{u(1)}^*(c_{i_1}) \cdots p_{u(k)}^*(c_{i_k})$$

and the same for $P_{u'}^*(c)$. Then it is enough to show that for v and v' two vertices that are linked by a path in Γ made of edges in I, and for any $c \in H^\bullet(Y)$, we have

$$p_v^*(c)G_I = p_{v'}^*(c)G_I$$

This follows from an induction on the length of the path, the length one case being implied by the relation (R1) in the definition of $N^\bullet(Y, \Gamma)$. ☐

Defining a differential on $N^\bullet(Y, \Gamma)$ is the same as defining a differential on $H^\bullet(Y^V)$ and defining the images of the elements G_e. We define the differential to be zero on $H^\bullet(Y^V)$ and given on the elements G_e by the formula

$$d(G_e) = [\Delta_e] \in H^2(Y^V)$$

Lemma 8.2. *The differential d is well-defined and makes $N^\bullet(Y, \Gamma)$ into a graded-commutative dga.*

Proof. The compatibility of d with the relation (R1) follows from the relation

$$p_v^*(c)[\Delta_e] = p_{v'}^*(c)[\Delta_e]$$

if v and v' are the endpoints of e, for all $c \in H^\bullet(Y)$. Let now R be the expression in the relation (R2). As in the proof of Lemma 2.1, it is enough to show that $d(R) = 0$ when $\{e_1, \cdots, e_r\}$ is a simple loop. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} d(R) &= \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j<i} (-1)^{i+j} [\Delta_{e_j}] G_{e_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{G_{e_j}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{G_{e_i}} \wedge \cdots \wedge G_{e_r} \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{i<j} (-1)^{i+j-1} [\Delta_{e_j}] G_{e_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{G_{e_i}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{G_{e_j}} \wedge \cdots \wedge G_{e_r} \end{aligned}$$

and it is enough to show that for $i < j$ we have

$$[\Delta_{e_i}] G_{e_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{G_{e_i}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{G_{e_j}} \wedge \cdots \wedge G_{e_r} = [\Delta_{e_j}] G_{e_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{G_{e_i}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{G_{e_j}} \wedge \cdots \wedge G_{e_r}$$

Let v_i, v_i' be the endpoints of e_i and v_j, v_j' the endpoints of j. Since $\{e_1, \cdots, e_r\}$ is a simple loop, we can assume that there is a path in Γ between v_i and v_j made of edges in $\{e_1, \cdots, \widehat{e_i}, \cdots, \widehat{e_j}, \cdots, e_r\}$, and the same thing for v_i' and v_j'. Let $P_i : Y^V \to Y^2$ be the projection $(p_{v_i}, p_{v_i'})$ and $P_j : Y^V \to Y^2$ be the projection $(p_{v_j}, p_{v_j'})$. We then have $[\Delta_{e_i}] = P_i^*([\Delta])$ and $[\Delta_{e_j}] = P_j^*([\Delta])$. The desired equality thus follows from Lemma 8.1 with $I = \{e_1, \cdots, \widehat{e_i}, \cdots, \widehat{e_j}, \cdots, e_r\}$. ☐

8.3. **The isomorphism with the Gysin model.** By choosing charts on Y, one easily sees that $L = \Delta_\Gamma$ is a hypersurface arrangement in $X = Y^V$. Thus theorem 6.9 can be applied to the pair (Y^V, Δ_Γ) and gives a model for the cohomology of $C(Y, \Gamma) = Y^V \setminus \Delta_\Gamma$. We fix an linear order on the set E of edges of Γ, hence on the irreducible components Δ_e of Δ_Γ. This allows us to consider the Gysin model $M^\bullet(Y^V, \Delta_\Gamma)$ such that

$$M_q^n(Y^V, \Delta_\Gamma) = \left(\bigoplus_{\substack{I \subset E \\ |I| = q-n \\ I \text{ indep.}}} H^{2n-q}(\Delta_I)(n-q) \right) / \sim_{\mathrm{OS}} .$$

We note that a subset $I \subset E$ is dependent if and only if it contains a loop, and is a circuit if and only if it is a simple loop.

We define a morphism of dga's

$$\alpha : N^\bullet(Y, \Gamma) \to M^\bullet(Y^V, \Delta_\Gamma)$$

in the following way.
First we note that for all n we have $M_n^n(Y^V, \Delta_\Gamma) = H^n(Y^V)$, and we easily see that the resulting (injective) map $H^\bullet(Y^V) \to M^\bullet(Y^V, \Delta_\Gamma)$ is a map of graded algebras. Then we define $\alpha(G_e)$ to be a generator g_e of $H^0(\Delta_e)(-1) \subset M_2^1(Y^V, \Delta_\Gamma)$.

Lemma 8.3. *The morphism α is well-defined and compatible with the differentials. It is thus a map of dga's.*

Proof. First we show that α respects the relations (R1) and (R2). For the relation (R1) we see that by definition

$$\alpha(p_v^*(c)G_e) = p_v^*(c)g_e = p_v^*(c)_{|\Delta_e} \in H^\bullet(\Delta_e).$$

This equals $i_e^*(p_v^*(c)) = (p_v \circ i_e)^*(c)$ where $i_e : \Delta_e \hookrightarrow Y^V$ is the inclusion of Δ_e. The relation then follows from the equality $p_v \circ i_e = p_{v'} \circ i_e$.
For the relation (R2) we can assume that we have $e_1 < \cdots < e_r$. Then if R is the expression in the relation (R2) we have

$$\alpha(R) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} (-1)^{i-1} g_{e_1} \cdots \widehat{g_{e_i}} \cdots g_{e_r}$$

and $g_{e_1} \cdots \widehat{g_{e_i}} \cdots g_{e_r}$ is a generator of $H^0(\Delta_{e_1} \cap \cdots \cap \widehat{\Delta_{e_i}} \cap \cdots \cap \Delta_{e_r})(-r+1)$. Since $\{\Delta_1, \cdots, \Delta_r\}$ is dependent, $\alpha(R)$ is thus killed by the quotient by $\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$.
We then show that α is compatible with the differentials. By definition, the differential is zero on $H^\bullet(Y^V) \subset M^\bullet(Y^V, \Delta_\Gamma)$. Furthermore, $d\alpha(G_e) = d(g_e)$ is, by definition of the Gysin morphism, the class of Δ_e in $H^2(Y^V)$. This completes the proof. ☐

Theorem 8.4. *The morphism $\alpha : N^\bullet(Y, \Gamma) \to M^\bullet(Y^V, \Delta_\Gamma)$ is an isomorphism of differential graded algebras.*

Proof. We sketch the proof and leave the details to the reader. We define the inverse morphism β in the following way. Let $I \subset E$ be an independent set of edges of Γ of cardinality $|I| = q - n$, let $i_I : \Delta_I \hookrightarrow Y^V$ be the inclusion of the corresponding stratum. Let $f_I : Y^V \to \Delta_I$ be any natural splitting of i_I, whose components are projections p_v's. Then we define the component of β:

$$\beta_q^n : H^{2n-q}(\Delta_I) \to H^{2n-q}(Y^V)G_I$$

to be the pull-back f_I^*. The degrees match since $H^{2n-q}(Y^V)G_I$ is in degree $2n - q + |I| = n$. It remains to prove that β passes to the quotient by $\sim_{\mathrm{OS}}$, and defines an inverse to α. ☐

REFERENCES

[1] P. Aluffi, “Chern classes of free hypersurface arrangements” *J. Singul.* **5** (2012), pp. 19-32.

[2] V. I. Arnol’d, “The cohomology ring of the colored braid group”, *Mat. Zametki* **5** (1969) pp. 227-231, *Math. Notes* **5** (1969), pp. 138-140.

[3] S. Bloch, “Motives, the fundamental group, and graphs” (2012), preprint.

[4] E. Brieskorn, “Sur les groupes de tresses (d’après V. I. Arnol’d)”, *Séminaire N. Bourbaki 1971/72*, exp. n°401, pp. 21-44.

[5] C. De Concini, C. Procesi, “Wonderful models of subspace arrangements”, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* **1** (1995), no.3, pp. 459-494.

[6] P. Deligne, “Théorie de Hodge, II”, *Publications mathématiques de l’I.H.E.S.* (1971) pp. 5-57.

[7] P. Deligne, “Théorie de Hodge, III”, *Publications mathématiques de l’I.H.E.S.* (1974) pp. 5-77.

[8] W. Fulton, R. MacPherson, “A compactification of configuration spaces”, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **139** (1994), no. 1, pp. 183-225.

[9] Y. Hu, “A compactification of open varieties”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **355** (2003), no. 12, pp. 4737-4753.

[10] I. Kriz, “On the rational homotopy type of configuration spaces”, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **139** (1994), no. 2, pp. 227-237.

[11] J. Leray, “Le calcul différentiel et intégral sur une variété analytique complexe (Problème de Cauchy III)”, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **87** (1959) pp. 81-180.

[12] L. Levine, “Orlik-Solomon Algebras of Hyperplane Arrangements”, notes on the author’s webpage.

[13] L. Li, “Wonderful compactification of an arrangement of subvarieties”, *Michigan Math. J.* **58** (2009), no. 2, pp. 535-563.

[14] L. I. Nicolaescu, “Mixed Hodge structures on smooth algebraic varieties”, notes on the author’s webpage.

[15] P. Orlik, L. Solomon, “Combinatorics and Topology of Complements of Hyperplanes”, *Invent. Math.* **56** (1980) pp. 167-189.

[16] P. Orlik, H. Terao, *Arrangements of Hyperplanes*, Springer-Verlag (1992).

[17] C. Peters, J. Steenbrink, *Mixed Hodge Structures*, Springer (2008).

[18] K. Saito, “Theory of logarithmic differential forms and logarithmic vector fields”, *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.* **27** (1980), no. 2, 265-291.

[19] H. Terao, “Forms with logarithmic pole and the filtration by the order of the pole”, *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Algebraic Geometry* (Kyoto Univ., Kyoto, 1977), pp. 673-685.

[20] B. Totaro, “Configuration spaces of algebraic varieties”, *Topology* **35** (1996), no.4, pp. 1057-1067.

[21] C. Voisin, *Hodge Theory and Complex Algebraic Geometry, I*, Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics (2002).

[22] S. Yuzvinsky, “Orlik-Solomon algebras in algebra and topology”, *Russ. Math. Surv.* **56** (2001), pp. 293-364.

INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU (IMJ), 4 PLACE JUSSIEU, 75005 PARIS, FRANCE
E-mail address: `cdupont@math.jussieu.fr`